This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE

WORDS OF THE LORD JESUS.

BY

RUDOLF STIER,

DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY, CHIEF PASTOR AND SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHKEUDITZ.

VOLUME SIXTH.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND REVISED AND ENLARGED GERMAN EDITION.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM B. POPE,

NEW EDITION.

PHILADELPHIA:
SMITH, ENGLISH, AND CO.
NEW YORK: SHELDON & CO. BOSTON: GOULD & LINCOLN.

MDCCCLX.

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

CONTENTS OF VOLUME SIXTH.

THE GOSPEL OF ST JOHN.

Page

First Fore-announcement of the Raising of Lazarus. The Honour of the Son of God. Walking in the Day. The Setting forth, ch. xi. 4, 7, 9–11, 14, 15, ... 1

Jesus and Martha. Second Fore-announcement: the Resurrection and the Life, ch. xi. 23, 25, 26, ... 20

The Sepulchre, the Stone, Faith, the Thanksgiving to the Father, the Raising, ch. xi. 34, 39–44, ... 33

The Anointing at Bethany, ch. xii. 7, 8; Matt. xxvi. 10–13; Mark xiv. 6–9, ... 58

Last public Declaration concerning his coming Death. The Corn of Wheat, and his Discipleship; the Prayer of Anguish; the Glorification; the brief Continuance of the Light, ch. xii. 23–36, . 75

The Evangelist's Summary of the Public Testimony of Jesus, ch. xii. 44–50, ... 101

The Washing of the Feet, and its Signification, ch. xiii. 7–20, . 109

The Second and more direct Indication of the Traitor, after the Supper, ch. xiii. 26, 27, ... 141

The Glorification of the Son of Man; the Entrance into the Inaccessible; the New Commandment, ch. xiii. 31–35, . . 149

The First Intimation of Peter's Denial, ch. xiii. 36–38; Luke xxii. 34, ... 172

Farewell Discourses of Jesus to His Disciples until His Setting out, ch. xiv. 1–31, ... 175

Faith in God and in Jesus. His Going before into the Father's House: Himself the way: the Father in Him as He in the Father, ch. xiv. 1–10, ... 181

Hosted by Google

Page

The Greater Works; the Praying and Loving; Fellowship with the departed Lord through the Comforter, in whom He and the Father Himself come; Separation in this from the World, ch. xiv. 11–24, ... 207

The Holy Ghost, once more, as Teacher and Remembrancer; the Peace left behind, and Given anew through His Departure to the Greater Father; the Powerlessness of the Prince of the World in his Aggression upon Him, ch. xiv. 25–31, . . 242

Renewed Farewell Discourses during the delay of the setting forth, chs. xv. xvi. Similitude of the Vine and the Branches, ch. xv. 1–6, ... 262

The Interpretation of the Similitude: the Love of the Lord in His Disciples bringing forth its Fruit, ch. xv. 7–17, . . 282

The Hatred of the World to the Disciples of their Lord: the Inexcusable Sin of Unbelief, ch. xv. 18–25, . . . 298

The Testimony of the Spirit of Truth against the World: Prediction to obviate Offence, ch. xv. 26–xvi. 4, . . . 315

The Comforter obtained by His departure will Convince the World, and glorify Jesus to His Disciples, ch. xvi. 5–15, . . 331

The way of the First Disciples, as typical for all Futurity, through Sorrow to Joy; the Joy of Birth; the perfect Joy of seeing Him again in that Day, ch. xvi. 16–24, . . . 369

Final Reference to the Great Future: now in Parable, then Openly: the Love and Faith of the Disciples in much Weakness: last Consolation derived from His overcoming the World, ch. xvi. 25–33, ... 393

The High-priestly Prayer, ch. xvii. 418

HARMONY.

	Page		Page
Matt. xxvi. 10–13, . .	58	John xii. 7, 8, . .	58
Mark xiv. 6–9, . .	58	,, xiii. 36–38, . .	172
Luke xxii. 34, . .	172		

Hosted by Google

THE GOSPEL OF ST JOHN.

FIRST FORE-ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE RAISING OF LAZARUS. THE HONOUR OF THE SON OF GOD. WALKING IN THE DAY. THE SETTING FORTH.

(John xi. 4, 7, 9–11, 14, 15.)

We already know the little household of Bethany, united in the happy bonds of Ps. cxxxiii.: blessed before of the God of Israel because of their religious mutual love; but now still more blessed, because *loved* with a special love by the Son of God manifest in the flesh. Diverse in their temperament and disposition—as in Mary and Martha we see the one with more facility pressing on to the choice of the one thing needful, and the other struggling with the needless unrest of her well-meaning mind—they were yet one in God, and in sincere faith towards Jesus, who therefore loved them all. This family of Bethany was selected, that in it, and for it, should take place the final, greatest, and most public miraculous attestation of the honour of the Son of God; the witness, that is, that He who was about to surrender Himself to death and the grave, was Himself the Resurrection and the Life. The sacred love of their Divine Friend designs, by leading their weak faith through the bitterness of death, to heighten its subsequent joy. We may well suppose that the enmity of the Jews would hereafter the more virulently burn against them in consequence; and to our minds the old opinion is not altogether so "untenable" as some now think, that the reason is to be sought in this for the remarkable silence of the Synoptics concerning the resurrection of Lazarus.[1]

[1] Lange enters very cautiously and discriminatingly into the merits of

Hosted by Google

This, however, is but one hypothesis, and much more might be added in explanation; so much, indeed, as effectually to shield them from Baur's insinuation against their historical credit in relation to this matter.

Suffice it, that St John's narrative in the eleventh chapter is so transparently true, and so entirely stamped with those attributes of historical simplicity and confidence which are impressed upon all the narratives of his Gospel, that only the blind can fail to discern the glory of God in it; and they to whom it is obscure darken their own apprehension by their own critical counsel. He presupposes an acquaintance with the whole substance of the so-called Synoptical tradition, and with the memorable sisters; for he indicates the τὶς ἀσθενῶν Λάζαρος first generally as ἐκ τῆς κώμης αὐτῶν, and immediately afterwards as their *brother*. Although he himself afterwards (ver. 5) arranges the three persons probably according to their ages and external position,[1] yet it is significant that in ver. 1 he mentions *Mary* first, who as a disciple was better known, and inwardly nearer to the heart of the Lord, and whose *anointing* was to be spoken of wherever the Gospel was preached. It is on this account that he presupposes in his readers a special acquaintance with *this* circumstance, down to the wiping of the feet with her hair—although himself afterwards commissioned to record it.

These sisters communicate to the Lord a very delicately worded, but urgent *request for help*, for their beloved brother lies dangerously sick. There needs no proof that ἀσθενεῖν is used of one in extreme peril of sickness (as Grot. remarks): comp. Acts ix. 37; Phil. ii. 26, 27. They would hardly have sent to Jesus so far, if there had not been danger of life; and the Lord's reply responds to the *feared* πρὸς θάνατον. Vers. 21

the question, ascribing this considerate silence to their original traditional formation, before the actual composition of the Gospels. On the other hand, Luthardt summarily dismisses all such consideration as superfluous and gratuitous.

[1] According to Lu. x. 38, Martha was the mistress of the house. Lazarus, the youngest, who now sank into early death for a brief space, might have dwelt with them, though neither ch. xi. nor ch. xii. 2 decides anything on this point. Dräseke suggests that Martha might be here mentioned first, to show that she was equally dear to Jesus with Mary.

Hosted by Google

and 32 afterwards show what they desired and hoped for. But what refined humility and confident urgency are blended in the message, as St John gives it to us in its most concise and simple truth! There is no trace of any lamentation or protest that one dear to the Son of God should be sick, as if that were a thing unseemly; it is only tasteless perversion of interpretation to put such a meaning into their words: a thoughtful application would learn from them, and teach, the truth that one whom the Lord loveth may quite consistently with that high privilege be sick. They may, indeed, presume that they have a claim to His help for cure or rescue from death:—yet only the right of grace on account of *His* love. They say not—He who loveth Thee so well, but—He *whom Thou lovest* in Thy free and great benevolence, whom Thou "honourest with Thy regard." Yet it seems to them too much to say at once (as Nonnus inserts) ὃν φιλέεις σκοπίαζε. The simple "*behold!*" connected with the "Lord!" which brings to mind His power, is enough for them: no further *expression* of request or reliance was needed. That He loves them too, his sisters, and for their sake will restore their brother, is reserved in humble silence.

Ver. 4. "The Lord" (vers. 2 and 3) responds to *such* a summons in a very marvellous manner, and not now as elsewhere to the urgent and unseasonable supplication of one altogether unknown. That He does give a reply, admits of no doubt. Schleiermacher, indeed, seems not to know "from this brief account" whether this was His reply, or a notice which He gave to His disciples concerning the character of the sickness(!)—but we cannot suppose the Evangelist's narrative to be so brief as to have excluded the Lord's response to the message. The Lord assuredly gives a reply in ver. 4, although in strikingly mysterious terms. It is not—I will come! and no express—Let him be healed! His *indefinite answer*, which He gives without any added promise of coming, includes, on the one hand, a consolation which dispels the fear of death as the issue, but, on the other, it leaves "*this sickness*" to itself, to run its appointed course. Indeed, the concluding words, in their grand, indefinite generality, might have suggested to thoughtful pondering hearers, that some mystery was involved in the apparently plain "*not* unto death." For the δόξα and δοξασθῆναι had too

Hosted by Google

lofty a sound for any ordinary recovery or healing. This of itself refutes the unhappy notion of many that the Lord Himself, after the manner of men, expected or predicted a recovery in these words;[1] and Lücke, who inclines that way, finds the *orthodox* exposition (as he calls the presupposition of superhuman foreknowledge, and with more propriety than he himself intended) *more easy*. We do not deny that elsewhere a human expectation or design at variance with the subsequent issue might be possible to Jesus, without any disparagement to His Divinity, and this we have on some occasions maintained in opposition to the general view: but *here*, in this narrative and in these words, it seems a thing more unimaginable the more it is reflected upon. The very beginning, *αὕτη ἡ ἀσθένεια*, with the decisive *οὐκ ἔστι* which follows, has a sound of full assurance, as if He had said:—I know *this sickness*, and its issue, so marvellously redounding to the glorification of God and Myself, full well! (Grotius: Ostendit Christus, notum sibi, quod tanquam nescienti indicabatur.) He knows already everything from the beginning—and this is the truth which pervades all St John's description of His mysterious words and acts. Yet, the more closely we contemplate this first utterance, the more "designedly obscure" does it appear, with all its tone of promise. It is abundantly easy to perceive that, if Lazarus died only that he might be raised again on the fourth day unto the glory of God, this sickness, yea, this brief death and sleep, was not essentially *unto* death in the ordinary sense, unto abiding death. The Berlenburg Bible compares, with pious ingenuity, the passage in the Psalm:—"Thus sings the Messiah, Ps. cxviii. 17, 18, I shall not die—but died nevertheless!" We have here the counterpart of 2 Kings xx. 1, where not only the history records חָלָה לָמוּת (Sept. *εἰς θάνατον*, still stronger than our *πρός*), but the Lord also Himself announces, by the prophet—Thou shalt die and not live! If that declaration of God, revoked through prayer in His Old-Testament condescension, was not untrue, still less is the present word of our Lord, whose "unto death" can and must be interpreted and understood in all its New-Testament

[1] Schleiermacher: Formed an opinion and judgment from what He heard; so that if the information should be found to have been insufficient, His "opinion" also might not coincide with fact!

Hosted by Google

depth. The same may even be said in a certain sense concerning the falling asleep of all whom the Lord loves, and who will awake only at the first resurrection. But there is no room for the further application which has been made by a spuriously profound exposition, to the sickness of sin—It is not unto death in the case of believers, but to the glory of the Son of God! Such reflections abandon altogether the ground of exegesis.

Unto the glory of God (ὑπὲρ is presently explained by ἵνα): —this promises a wonderful aid, just in the sense of ch. ix. 3. But that this will come through the *Son of God* is *here* made emphatically prominent, though obviously of itself to be understood, because it was to be here made triumphantly manifest that the honour or glory of God (ver. 40) is one with the glory of His Son (ch. ii. 11). Thus it is a testimony similar to ch. v. 23; xiv. 13. The resurrection of Lazarus is the comprehensive concluding symbol of all the miracles exhibiting the glory of God in Christ.

We cannot doubt, though it is not expressly indicated, that this single appropriately ordered utterance was the entire answer given to the sisters; they received no subordinate reply which St John has not recorded. The Lord's dignity discloses itself in the reserve with which, when He *heard* the message, He said these words and no more; and scarcely can we suppose Him to have even added—Tell them this! And what when this message was delivered? Alas, it is highly probable that their brother had in the meantime died! Ebrard assumes, without any reason, that Jesus afterwards went "slowly and circuitously" on the journey, which required no more than a day, from the south of the Jordan to Bethany; and thus he interposes six or seven days between this word and the resurrection. But how, and for what purpose, is this assumed? The reckoning of the days in ver. 6 must certainly be taken in connection with ver. 39, so that the death of Lazarus occurred soon after, if it had not already taken place when the Lord spoke the words of ver. 4.[1] Ver. 5 must at least be as straitly connected with what follows as with what precedes; for the Evangelist confirms the bold ὃν

[1] So Lange, concurring with most expositors; comp. Dräseke's Lazarus, S. 64. This is more simple than Bengel's assumption that Lazarus died precisely when the Lord announced the κεκοίμηται, ver. 11; although this

Hosted by Google

φιλεῖς of the message by his ἠγάπα, as he continues: nevertheless, when He heard this ἀσθενεῖν of him whom He loved, He still delayed two whole days, after having given the indefinite promise that the Son of God would be glorified in this sickness. We may suppose that He had something to accomplish ἐν ᾧ ἦν τόπῳ, or rather that He was not here, as anywhere, unemployed: but neither the account in ch. x. 41, 42, nor the presently following word of our Lord in ch. xi. 9, 10, leads to the supposition of any specially rich and gracious sphere of activity; the latter passage, indeed, seems to indicate the departure to awaken His friend as His more distinctive work, the commission given to Him for the employment of the little time that remained to Him. So that it is at all events a useless controversy of the expositors which asserts (with Schleiermacher) or denies, that "the Lord would sacrifice to the more particular and slighter necessities of His friends in Bethany, the more general and important necessity of His presence at the Jordan." In the motives of His manner of acting, as in the providence of the Father, many things were at once and together and without any conflict between them considered: but it is most conformable to the sense of the narrative to admit a reference to the great joy which should be in Bethany as the leading motive. His love wittingly delays, that it may more gloriously console them after their sufferings. The sickness and dying of those *whom He loves* is not a matter, generally, of such perilous and urgent moment; and this must His beloved ones in Bethany learn, and ourselves from them; of course there is no room for any *obligation* to hasten to their help, unless other more important matters should prevent. Lavater says somewhere: "Our Lord lets them only *wait*, whom He loved most; His keeping them waiting is just the sign that He purposes to help them in His own way, that is, *as God*." And every candid mind must admit, what it was scarcely necessary for Olshausen to enforce, that the dying of Lazarus was intended to be to himself as well as to his sisters, an occasion of spiritual good. Alford has lately excellently expressed himself thus: "It need hardly be remarked, that the glorifying of the

would give profound evidence of that Divine knowledge of the sickness of His humanly loved friend, which we cannot suppose them to have in any case lacked.

Hosted by Google

Son of God in Lazarus *himself* is subordinately implied. Men are not mere tools, but temples, of God."

Ver. 7. There now follow our Lord's sayings on occasion of the departure for Bethany, which the disciples had ceased to expect—the ἔμειναν is recorded only *ex eventu*. Ἄγειν or ὑπάγειν is found also in the Sept. for בּוֹא or הָלַךְ. But εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, again, is significantly indefinite; He does not speak expressly of Bethany and Lazarus, as if the latter had passed from His mind, or ver. 4 had already said all on that subject. Hence the disciples, thus challenged by the πάλιν, express with more than confidence their suspicions. Thus arises a *further colloquy* with these disciples:—first, the removal of the *hesitation* expressed in ver. 8, and then, the solution of a *misunderstanding* indicated in vers. 12, 13. The disciples were certainly at rest concerning Lazarus, although we should scruple to say positively that "they discerned in the Lord's answer a mighty decree of healing," or that "His words *must* have been understood of His communicating His distant power to save." (Ebrard.) Even on this assumption their object retains something of improper boldness. Νῦν, just now, very recently—the taking up of the stones is still present to their eyes, and they calculate upon the continuance of that enmity and the consequent danger. They had supposed from our Lord's first message that He would not entrust Himself to Jerusalem, and remind Him, as it were, of His inconsistency! They receive a twofold answer: first, in vers. 9, 10, the general composing assurance as to His own action and procedure; and, afterwards ver. 11, a specific declaration of His purpose and reason for going to Bethany.

Vers. 9, 10. These words connect themselves with ch. ix. 4, 5, as the first saying in ver. 4 had been a remembrancer of ver. 3 of that chapter: yet they do not express precisely the same idea, as Rosenmüller and Kuinoel think, and as Teschendorff superficially concludes.[1] Nor is the whole, as has been said, intended *merely* as a rule of life for the disciples; but the Lord first of all expresses the procedure, law, and obligation of His own walk, and in terms which have a deeper meaning than that He

[1] "Nothing is done in the night, because there is no light. But now is My day in which I can work: it will presently be over, and I can work no more. Therefore must I go." Nicodemus, S. 143.

Hosted by Google

would walk in the daytime! De Wette (S. u. K. 1834, 4, 934) regards as capricious and obscure the view of Olshausen and Tholuck, which enters well into the spirit of the words, but the fault of obscurity as to the profound symbolical meaning of such words, and limitation of their wide range of application, is altogether on his own side. Let us calmly and thoughtfully develop this saying, and we shall not go astray.

Are there not *twelve hours* in the day? This is, first of all, to be clearly understood according to the Jewish custom; for though it remains a difficult problem to the learned to decide whether, and since when, the Hebrews knew or adopted the proper division of hours (the שָׁעָה of Daniel is well known to be indefinite)—it is, on the other hand, tolerably certain that in later times the day, as extending from the rising to the setting of the sun, was divided into twelve hours, longer or shorter according to the season of the year; and Winer appeals to this passage as sufficient evidence. (Article *Tag.*) According to this, our Lord designs not *merely* to speak (as Schleiermacher thinks) of public or concealed walking; for as in ch. ix. 4 the expression "*while* it is day" cannot mean merely "before the eyes of all," so neither can publicity merely be meant here. Wherefore then is the mention and the reckoning of the *hours?* The Lord manifestly first of all designs to signify by the day the time of life *allotted to Him*, before the running out of which He might not and would not cease to perform His works; a meaning which coincides in its fundamental idea, as with ch. ix. 4, so also with Luke xiii. 32. Yet not, as Lücke applies it—I have *only* the twelve hours, and they are nearly run out: but rather conversely—full twelve hours, and the last is not yet come! Bengel: jam multa hora, sed tamen adhuc dies. I walk in My day, that is (according to Hess), "My vocation upon earth has a proper relation to My time." The same Hess (whose expositions, sometimes original and penetrating, are now almost overlooked) excellently paraphrases here: "Think ye, indeed, that that which makes you anxious on My account, can take place one hour before the time appointed of God brings it? As a traveller has his twelve hours for his day's journey, so also to Me there is a space of time appointed for My business; as long as this lasts, I am as sure that no mischance can befall Me, as one

Hosted by Google

who walketh in the day is *more secure* than he who travels in the night." In which well-weighed comparative *more secure* it is already intimated that the figure does not suit in its rigorous letter. For we ought to be as much accustomed, as expositors of the sayings of the Lord, to this incongruence in His similitudes, as we are to the circumstance that He habitually makes profound and many-sided applications of them.

This last He does here. De Wette is able to perceive that *the light of this world* or the *sun* is not mentioned as a *defence* against evil, any more than the night, on the other hand, can indicate the lack of Divine protection; but that the words have reference generally to some defence and security he also admits, inasmuch as he rightly understands προσκόπτειν (stumble, fall) of danger of mishap, and not directly in a moral sense. Lücke perceives in it moral stumbling and falling, the danger of sin; Baümlein, stumbling against the Divine will! But the disciples had not imagined the possibility of our Lord's erring or sinning through inadvertence; they had only warned Him against danger. We therefore hold fast our conviction (in spite of Luthardt's protest) that He does not justify His own action, but reassure His disciples, in these words. Braune has discerned a further subtile allusion: "I *fall* not under the *stones* of the Jews, *stumble* not against them." *Afterwards*, indeed, in the application which the saying makes to *us*, the simile of stumbling may and must be regarded as signifying that personal guilt is involved. But if the former προσκόπτειν did not speak of external danger at all, where would be the connection between the Lord's answer and the solicitous warning of the disciples? It is manifest, however, that He here extends the simile newly used in chap. ix., inasmuch as He introduces a spiritual significance into the *seeing the light*, the express self-direction according to God's heavenly order of man's day and hour. And He further incorporates a second thought on the same figure: "He does not regard the *space and continuance* of His walking in the day till night alone, but includes the *difference between walking in the day and walking in the night*." (Nitzsch.) De Wette protests against the general significance of this distinction, as pointing to moral purity or impurity, and would rather refer it to "a sincere, open *prudence* in minister-

Hosted by Google

ing the truth;" but yet he is constrained to give prominence to the moral element too, in order to avoid falling into what he rejects as a "frosty" interpretation, the *mere* injunction of foresight. But whither does this minute precision in distinguishing the thoughts of this full and profound figurative language lead us? The Lord begins by speaking of danger, as far as concerns Himself, and in harmony with the thought of the disciples; but He goes on in the same word to set forth a universal human rule, concerning the morally significant knowledge and avoidance of danger. We may say with Nitzsch: "the *seeing, provident,* and *visible* walking" (a threefold meaning at once!), "the walking in the day—is walking in truth and righteousness, manifestly under the eye of God," etc.

But, further, is not Jesus, according to ch. ix. 5, Himself the Light of the world? Assuredly, but He is so only in that He at the same time as man and as Son walks with the Father in His view, lives in the life of God; hence, "I must and can, within My prescribed limits, fearlessly await My vocation in My own and the Father's light."[1] (Meyer.) His βλέπειν τὸ φῶς is partly the *cognitio* paterni propositi (according to Grotius), partly the *obedience* belonging thereto. Walking in the night, unusual to *Him*, would be certainly an ἄτοπον, from which the disciples undesignedly and unthinkingly seemed to dissuade Him by their warning; *therefore* the saying passes over to *this* meaning, to the danger that (*if* He were like ourselves) anything human might befall Him, or He Himself might make a false step. In the former clause He condescendingly placed Himself on a level, in a certain sense, with His disciples and other men (therefore ἐάν τις); but ver. 10 passes over into the opposite (and ch. xii. 35 may be compared with it), according to Olshausen's perfectly correct remark: "the former clause has respect rather to Himself, the latter to His disciples."[2] To discern such na-

[1] "The vocation of a man is the sun in the heavens of his life"—this general proposition, which Dräseke derives from this passage, has its specific application to the Son of man.

[2] Lange (iii. 654), on the other hand, too much: The whole discourse, the whole simile is spoken rather with reference to the disciples than to the Lord. For He begins with Himself as the walker by day, and then sets us walkers by night in opposition.

Hosted by Google

tural transition and progression in the thought, is by no means to confound different meanings. As the undertone, we hear: Think ye then that I could ever be a walker in the night, mistaking My time and vocation, *as ye might do?* And further: Fear ye not to go with Me! Walk ever with Me and in My light (ch. viii. 12)—as I in My Father's light, which is in Me!

And this, finally, gives us the transition and key to the much contested ἐν αὐτῷ.[1] For while Lücke truly says, that He now speaks, not as in ch. ix. 4, of the night in which no man *can* work, but of the night in which no man *should* walk—yet the reason that the walker in the night is without light, must be sought in himself. The figure is now, finally, and most significantly, turned to an inward application.[2] To say nothing of the artificial reference of ἐν αὐτῷ to κόσμος, philological arguments have been used to remove this peculiar ἐν;[3] but these attempts deviate from St John's phraseology, and fail to correspond with the meaning of the Lord's word. Lange discerns the transition, to pursue it no further, when he says: "it is perfectly in harmony with the optical relations of all our Lord's utterances, that He defines the light which enlightens man to be an influence *within him:* hence He terms the eye the light of the body." (This nearly coincides with that of Grotius: ἐν αὐτῷ, in oculis ejus, receptione enim lucis et specierum fit visio.) And does not the Lord make the *deepest* view of the figure turn to the inward application? Is it not true of him who by his own fault walks outside his vocation, without the obedient reference to God's will, that is, as here, in the night, that, "without the true light in him, no light shines upon him?" Shine it ever so brightly in the heavens, for his eye it exists not. There is, finally, another interpretation, which Brandt defends: He has not the light (naturally) in himself, he cannot in the night, without light from above, care for, secure, and

[1] Comp. what we have said upon the ἕξει, ch. viii. 12, in Vol. iv.

[2] Berlenb. Bibel.: "Here Christ begins an inward application."

[3] And in 1 John ii. 10, σκάνδαλον ἐν αὐτῷ assuredly does not mean, as de Wette thinks, coram or in oculis ejus, as ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς, Matt. xxi. 42. Ἐν ὑμῖν ch. xii. 35 in the plural (which de Wette also adduces), does not by any means prove that ἐν stands here for μετά. More pertinent is ἐν ἐμοί, 1 Cor. xiv. 11 (apud me, בִּי for לִי—but comp. Winer, 3 Ausg. S. 177, 331). The softened *lux ei non adest*, οὐ βλέπει τὸ φῶς—cannot by any method be established.

Hosted by Google

direct himself. This is penetrating and true in itself; but far-fetched as an exposition of this passage. The whole is well summed up, when we understand by walking in the night, according to Meyer's note, "work equivocal and without a calling," that is, rendered culpable by internal neglect of reference to God's will; so that the same work which might and should have been done in God, may be done by him who has not this light without a call, without a blessing, and consequently without protection. This is more than Lange's "prolongation of life obtained by unfaithfulness—haunting the scene—having outlived himself." For the idea of an appointed time, with which the words set out, is now in contrast—since the question is to *know* that time—regarded inwardly as confidence and simplicity of walking:—how *could* any one ever, when his day has ended, thus wander about? There are *hours* of this day, first, following, and last, for distinctive appointed works:—Watch for God's hour, and walk according to it, so wilt thou never suffer harm, and if thou goest to thy death, it will be as thy Lord and Master going to the resurrection of His friend. Only go with Him, even though at first with the mind of Thomas! But if thou regardest man alone and avoidest danger, thou art already wandering in the night, and thy stumbling will surely find thee in thy weak retreating.

Ver. 11. Not till the Lord has given the disciples some time to ponder His previous word, does He give unasked a more distinct explanation of His determination *ἄγειν εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν πάλιν*:—I will go to Bethany, to Lazarus, and, as I said before, in order that God may be glorified in His Son! Whatever doubts may rise as to whether St John has reproduced literally all and every word of Jesus in His later discourses, no man can deny that he has faithfully seized and exhibited the manner and spirit of our Lord's speech. But when we now see how simply concise, how humanly plain and divinely profound, how sublimely dignified, were the utterances of our Lord in connection with such external occurrences as this, we may gain courage to take to ourselves such words—indelibly impressed by their character, or brought back unaltered to memory—as the actual words which proceeded from His lips. (Apart from the promise of the Holy Spirit, John xiv. 26, whether or not referring to the actual letter.) And as to this present word, how entirely and

Hosted by Google

thoroughly characteristic is it, with all its plainness and simplicity! Have ye then altogether forgotten *our* beloved *Lazarus* and his sickness to the glory of God, and My glory? And would ye not more closely experience the truth and essential meaning of the word which I spake; would ye not sympathise and share in the great event, and see *how* My glory is revealed—even though ye suppose it has been already manifested? Therefore Lazarus is at once mentioned without any preface: a name which would, as it, were, recall to true consideration the fearful disciples. And mentioned with the most affectionate condescension: ὁ φίλος ἡμῶν instead of ὃν φιλῷ. Bengel: Quantâ humanitate Jesus amicitiam suam cum discipulis communicat! He *sleepeth*—thus the Lord speaks, as if He would make this last resurrection a remembrancer of that first awakening of the sleeping maiden.[1] From all antiquity men generally, and the Israelites, had used this euphemism in speaking of death, yet rather with regard to its outward appearance, and to throw a softening veil over the grave; but this phrase becomes a new and living one in the lips of our Lord, to disclose the great promise which had hitherto slumbered in Himself. We find in Job: ἄνθρωπος κοιμηθεὶς οὐ μὴν ἀναστῇ—καὶ οὐκ ἐξυπνισθήσονται ἐξ ὕπνου αὐτῶν (ch. xiv. 12)—but the Lord promises here in simple majesty an ἐξυπνίσω. To this end I go! The πορεύομαι instead of the former ἄγωμεν is naturally thus explained; but it contains at the same time the gentle reproach—Will not *ye* fearful ones go with Me to our friend, to see his glorious awaking?[2]

In this way, for no other expressions at first could have been used, did the Lord speak περὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ; and with the design, if not in the sure expectation, that they would at once understand Him aright. Strauss wonders that they did not understand Him; and no wonder that Strauss does so, for his perverse wonder is always at hand. If it had been written that the disciples understood at once, he would very likely have thought that improbable. We rational people reflect that our

[1] Dräseke's reference of the saying to the former words concerning day and night, is needless and inappropriate; for the subject there was a night in which man walks and stumbles, not in which he sleeps.

[2] We cannot see why Luthardt gainsays this. The Lord plainly says—I go assuredly; and in this lies—Will ye not go with Me?

Hosted by Google

Lord's categorical *οὐ πρὸς θάνατον* would be likely to create such a misunderstanding, even if they had been more accustomed than we can suppose them to have been to such high phraseology. The Lord had promised, as they thought, His healing; and hence they think at once of a favourable crisis followed by a cure.[1] Not merely did the *delay* of Jesus, and the expectation of a coming kingdom for all His friends, prevent them from contemplating death in this case; but the declared promise of the Lord had put it out of their thoughts. And they would indeed be led astray by the circumstance that the Lord designs to set out expressly for the purpose of *awaking* him; but as they are far from any thought of death having befallen the friend in Bethany, they interpret this strange word, as an affectionate, and almost pleasant way of speaking on the part of their condescending Master—And I will see how he wakes up and how he is after his sleep. Or did they (as de Wette thinks), supposing that in the design of Jesus the waking him was to be the means of his cure, reply to their Master—It is altogether unnecessary that Thou shouldst go there for that purpose, as he will already have awaked of himself? I think not, for such a means of cure was never thought of. Nor can I see why Luthardt (who presses my words to their utmost [fast ein wenig scherzende Rede] and forgets their qualification) should so peremptorily reject the idea of the disciples' receiving the Lord's words as a pleasant way of saying that He would go to see how His friend was after awaking. For I still think that if we consider it well, we shall find this view more tenable than Ebrard's supposition that they "knew not wherefore Jesus would *disturb* his beneficial condition of sleep—expressed their surprise that He would rouse him from so healthy a process, *since men are not wont to awake sleeping patients.*" His controversy with this last saying of Strauss has led him too far, for they could not seriously think of a sleep which should last till they reached Bethany. But as the Lord had spoken of going and awaking him, they seem to adopt the same way of speaking which they impute to their

[1] It is so well known that sleep is restorative in sickness (Ecclus. xxxi. or xxxiv. 2), that we need no rule of the Gemara concerning signs of cure, nor any other such learned reference as the hackneyed saying of Menander, *ὕπνος δὲ πάσης ἐστὶν ὑγίεια νόσου.*

Hosted by Google

Master, and reply—Wherefore awake him? let him sleep on in tranquillity for a while, and thus be restored! Their earnest meaning in the background rested upon the fear and hesitation about entering Judæa and the neighbourhood of Jerusalem which still remained in their minds.

Vers. 14, 15. The Lord resolves their misunderstanding by an answer which meets their words in a threefold way. He opposes to their falsely interpreted *εἰ κεκοίμηται* the undisguised *ἀπέθανεν*, which must have fallen upon them as a thunderbolt. As soon, however, as their *σωθήσεται* is thus taken away from them, the Lord abundantly restores it to them in the assuring *χαίρω* as regards Himself, which promises and pledges a glorious awakening out of that sleep. Finally, their unuttered, but latent fearful hesitation is put to shame, and corrected by the prediction of an increase of *faith* on their part, so that the *ἄγωμεν* may now be restored, after *πορεύομαι* alone had been used in the interval. They who are capable of so thinking may agree with Lücke and Neander, that a second message, announcing, unknown to the disciples, the actual death of Lazarus, is conceivable: for our own part we reject it on every ground. It can find no place in the compact narrative of the Evangelist, who, in ver. 11, says expressly *καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο λέγει*; for that would be a marvellously long *μετὰ τοῦτο* after the *ταῦτα εἶπε*. And it is "an injury to the Divine glory of the Redeemer" to regard Him as speaking thus oracularly and solemnly of a message which He had received, without naming it—more befitting Strauss than the historical Christ. Finally, it is inconceivable that Martha and Mary would have immediately sent the intimation of his death—for to what end? That the Lord might raise him up? We read afterwards that they did not contemplate this, even when He promised a resurrection, when He stood before the grave, when He commanded the stone to be rolled away. Was it that He might comfort and weep with them? Alas, their tone of mind ventured not even upon that, they were absorbed in that one thought—If He had been here—![1] Then, indeed, would they have prayed Him to avert

[1] As it regards any other having brought Him the intelligence—who may interpose such a thought, instead of reading the Evangelist as he intended to be read and understood?

Hosted by Google

death; then, indeed, death would not have entered into the presence of their Lord. Both these, the more profoundly we penetrate them, give us to understand the Lord's *joy* at that which was their sorrow, viz., that He had *not* been there. The disciples understood it first, Then would He not have been able to refuse Himself to their prayers and to the work of healing—and there is some truth in that. But Bengel's words go deeper: "It is consonant with Divine propriety, that no one is ever spoken of as dead in the presence of the Prince of life. If you suppose that death could not have touched Lazarus in the presence of Jesus, *the language of the two sisters*, vers. 21, 32, *attains thereby a more sublime conception.*" The Lord (as Neander reminds us) assuredly does not say that He had kept aloof in order to allow Lazarus first to die; He rather now *is glad* that, other reasons having induced His tarrying, it had come to that. And this joy expressly witnesses that this turn in the event had not been immediately a design of our Lord. Yet He perfectly well knew all things from ver. 4 onwards.

The ἵνα πιστεύσητε is closely connected, by a transposition of the phrase, with the emphatic δι' ὑμᾶς. Here we have once more the great word *believe:* comp. presently vers. 25, 26, 40. That we should more and more perfectly believe on Him, the Son, in whom the Father is honoured, is not only the end of all that St John wrote, but of all that Jesus did, and of the way in which He did it. In particular, He permitted Lazarus, by not going to him, to die, that he himself, his sisters, the disciples, and many Jews (ver. 45), might believe in Him:—these last beginning their faith, and all the others deepening and confirming it. We may leave it undetermined whether the Lord referred expressly (as Schleiermacher thinks) to their faith in His own so often promised resurrection; ver. 25 afterwards almost induces such a consequence. Spinoza in Bayle is recorded to have said that if he could believe the resurrection of Lazarus, he would break his own system in pieces and become a Christian: but we may reply that, conversely, such a philosopher must first break up his system in order to be capable of believing. Anything like an actual irresistible demonstration that Lazarus was more than apparently dead was not possible even for those who were then present, despite the ἤδη ὄζει of Martha, ver. 39, and

Hosted by Google

even if their senses had confirmed her words; for the effluvium of sickness and that of corruption cannot in some cases be distinguished. Indeed, as Schubert says, "putrefaction in individual members may consist with the ultimate movements of latent life." As the "system" of Spinoza itself, in opposing all self-deception, rests not upon any incontrovertible external or internal facts, so there are no miracles, inducing faith in Christ, from which, *as φαινόμενα* and *βλεπόμενα*, certain assurance must *methodo mathematicâ* follow. But for him who has come to faith in the person of Christ and the testimony of Scripture concerning Him, in the way indicated John vii. 17, the *ἀπέθανεν* of the Lord's own lips would be better evidence than all the *visa reperta* of the medical faculty.

He is *dead:* and yet—*go to him!* In this last *πρὸς αὐτὸν* is repeated the promise of the *ἐξυπνίζειν* for the *κεκοιμημένος*. But that now, after death is plainly mentioned, the Lord no longer expressly speaks of *ἐξυπνίζειν* or *ἐγείρειν*, we shall resolve, with Grotius (who sometimes is as subtile in his remarks as Bengel), into a *modestia*.

St John does not tell us what either himself, or the other Apostles, thought or said in connection with this word of our Lord; but he records a highly characteristic word of the morbid and hesitating Thomas, equally full of love and hard of faith. He remains altogether in misconception, even after the misapprehension as to the favourable sleep had been removed; but he does not recede entirely into ver. 8. We have *ἄγωμεν* a third time, coinciding with the first and the last word of our Lord. It almost appears as if He would thereby overcome some remaining distrust and shrinking among the disciples:—What remains then but that we follow and be where He is? That *μετ' αὐτοῦ* does not refer to Lazarus needs very little demonstration, though many arbitrarily maintain it. Schleiermacher says correctly, "Thomas and the other disciples belonged not to Lazarus, the individual common friend, but to the Lord. What kind of faith in Christ, and what kind of devotion to Him would it have argued, if Thomas, in the presence of His disciples, could have said that to die with another individual friend would be a greater satisfaction to him than to live with the Lord." Lücke has most briefly and pertinently remarked, that in the *καὶ ἡμεῖς*

Hosted by Google

spoken to the *συμμαθηταῖς*, there already is contained a *σὺν αὐτῷ*, which is naturally continued in the *μετ' αὐτοῦ*. He is the great Master, and we disciples belong to Him! We may not so quickly rebut the other assumption, that Thomas had so understood the Lord's *ἄγωμεν πρὸς αὐτὸν* as if the way would lead into the other world, where Lazarus then was. (So Bengel, who compares 2 Sam. xii. 13.) We do not declare this at once to be forced, but perceive an accordance between this *πρὸς αὐτόν* and Thomas' words, which cannot be overlooked; though we are less inclined to think that he so expressly interpreted and understood the Lord's saying, than that his troubled thoughts prematurely *imposed* that meaning upon it.[1] Thus are men apt, in such a frame of mind, to dwell upon the last and most mournful word, pretermitting or forgetting all else. Thus Thomas has forgotten what had been said about *awaking!* But Hanstein incorrectly paints Thomas, when he says, "Now that the friend in Bethany was actually dead, and the Master had determined to awake him, to glorify the name of God, any further interference would be indecorous (and not so before?)—and how unkind towards the family in Bethany! He will go now and raise Lazarus—so might Thomas firmly believe (would this 'unbelieving' one believe what *Mary* did not believe?)—but with equally firm assurance that the going to raise Lazarus would be going to Jesus' own death." By this example we warn preachers against neglecting exegesis; and we enter so largely into Thomas' word, because such expressions of the disciples exhibit the then influence of the Lord's words in such a manner as to shed a reflection upon their present meaning and force for us.

Lampe's psychology is at fault when he here asserts: "there is something of murmuring here, in that he does not direct his words openly to the Lord Himself, but spread them secretly among the disciples, and thus sought to fill their minds with disquietude and terror." No, we have not the slightest trace of any such secret murmuring; he does not design to produce disaffection in his fellow-disciples' minds, but to encourage them by

[1] The opinion of Bartholinus (de morbis biblicis) is a curiosity of learning: Thomas was here afraid that they might be subject to the contagion of the body.

Hosted by Google

his calm ἄγωμεν to obedience. He speaks "without hypocrisy, but without joy" (Roos). There is nothing of disquietude and terror, but all is resignation—such *resignation*, however, as mingles some degree of unbelieving doubt with the devotion of love.[1] Thus much is true, but there is no "cowardice in the words under the semblance of courage," no "alloy of bitterness," as even Dräseke is tempted to think, but the kernel of all is *love* and *devotion*. Thus is he the same Thomas, whose character Hase defines as "melancholy tenderness"—as in ch. xiv. 5 and xx. 25. All must *die*, His dearest friends,—and Himself,—then let us die with Him! Let all go as it may—*with Him to death!* And if all the hopes of kingdom and life built upon Him come to nought—the dependence of love should remain! In such a mingled tone of mind, neither is the desire to die nor the fear of death to be altogether involved or excluded;[2] it remains an indistinct, uncompleted word and feeling, as are almost all such expressions of the various influences upon the disciples' minds, each according to his character.[3] But in the midst of his unbelief, it is the profoundest trust of his heart which speaks, and which will not separate from *Him;* it is this which makes it a prophetic and symbolical word, and therefore it is recorded by the Holy Ghost through the Evangelist John. *We*, who have not merely the resurrection of Lazarus before our eyes, but also the resurrection and glorification of Jesus, should glorify the troubled word of Thomas into a word of joy for the following of our Lord;—as Siegmund has done in his classical hymn, which is not meaningless allusion, but good old symbolism:—Let us with Jesus go—with Jesus suffer—with Jesus die—with Jesus *live!*

[1] Braune: We would ofttimes rather lay us down weary in the grave, than struggle on in the glowing hope of faith.

[2] By which we may correct the assertion of Chrys. in Klee, that the word expresses fear, not desire!

[3] If the Lord's death were the question, they could only *deprecate* it, with Peter; or die *with Him*, with Thomas. (Hofmann, Weiss. u. Erf. ii. 265.)

Hosted by Google

JESUS AND MARTHA. SECOND FORE-ANNOUNCEMENT: THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE.

(Chap. xi. 23, 25, 26.)

It is not by a meeting between Jesus and the profoundly susceptible Mary, that the narrative conducts us towards the sanctuary of this resurrection; but, before that, by His interview with *Martha*, whose soul tarried rather in the outer court of the life of faith. When Mary is introduced, the still procedure of that interview and its most touching utterances are interrupted by the surrounding ὄχλος of the Jews; and thus the intense interest of the situation, in its conflict between that which was most internal and outward things, between the most sublime emotions and the ceremonial of common life and death, is strained to the utmost; and a typical-dramatical scene rises before us, such as belongs to the most beautiful of sacred history. No Evangelist, and assuredly no legend-making church-consciousness (that Nothing which is now after eighteen centuries invented to account for the Gospel narratives!) either would or could have constructed such a history as this if the facts had not thus taken place under the direction of that providence which overruled even the prophecy of Caiaphas, and the evident stamp of which is impressed with increasing distinctness upon events and words, when they approach the μυστήριον προφορικόν of the passion of the Son of God. The pen of John alone, under the direction of the Holy Ghost, could do justice, in all its pure and perfect simplicity, to the narrative which contains the symbol of such a mystery; we might almost say that it was for this reason that the Synoptics passed it over in silence, and left it to him.

In rigorously historiographical form St John first gives the framework around the Lord's words, the essential matter of the whole; and, to this end, he records the state of things which Jesus *finds* on His arrival at Bethany. Thus the εὗρεν of ver. 17 (strictly belonging to ἐλθὼν) refers, in a certain sense, to the

Hosted by Google

whole down to ver. 21; and by no means intends to say that the Lord now first learned that this was the fourth day since the death which He Himself had well known of. The dead friend is in the grave, many Jews are round the sisters as sorry comforters, Martha first hears of His arrival and hastens to meet Him. The interment, contrary to the early patriarchal and Egyptian custom, took place speedily after the death, probably for the sake of avoiding as much as possible the Levitical defilement. The topographical statement in ver. 18 gives the explanation of the plentiful visitation of sympathisers from the neighbouring Jerusalem, mentioned in ver. 19.[1] Miserable comforters aggravating their deep affliction, are most of them, at least, in this week-long ceremonial of grief. "It seems to have been a family of consideration," as Hess remarks; more subtile is Lange's idea, that "some were the more zealous to be there, as thinking the opportunity favourable for recalling a family, which was well known to be attached to Jesus, from error to the safe way of ancient Judaism." So under the semblance of consolation, ungentle and afflicting reflections upon the powerlessness of Jesus to help might be supposed to have been hazarded: comp. afterwards ver. 37.

At length in His hour He comes, and as *more* than a comforter: He will show them the glory of God, and thereby advance towards His own death. It is obvious enough, and capable of much amplification, that the distinctive character of each of the two women appears in their several deportment, just as St Luke has described it; but we cannot regard it as *immediately* illustrative of character, that Mary does not go forth to meet the Lord. According to Niemeyer, "she does not appear to notice the first rumour of His arrival"—but this seems hardly consonant with the procedure of the event. Schleiermacher says that the report of the Lord's arrival had reached *the sisters*,

[1] Τὰς περὶ Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίαν, although the formula in Acts xiii. 13 includes companions, seems to us here to designate simply their persons (Gr. οἱ περὶ and οἱ ἀμφὶ), as the Syr. and Vulg. translate. Cod. D. omits τὰς περὶ, and Lachmann gives πρὸς τὴν. To suppose, with Luthardt, that they came to comfort the other attendant weepers also, has something strange in it, even if they are regarded as sorrowful relatives; while to make the αὐτὰς refer to Martha and Mary alone, is still more harsh, after such an interpretation of τὰς περὶ.

Hosted by Google

but that Mary nevertheless remained behind on account of those who were with her in the house; but this is not to be supposed. We think that the tidings of the approach of Jesus were brought by some one[1] to Martha as the mistress of the house, or, if it be preferred, as the more accessible: of this Mary hears nothing, as ver. 28 evidently shows. It is highly natural that Martha should at once go to meet Him (the ταχύ explains itself); and that she, busied with the entertainment and reception of guests and apart from Mary, should not go first and tell her sister, and take her with her, is equally natural, without having recourse to the explanation that "she *forgot* it through haste." Ἐκαθέζετο is not intended as the simple opposite of ὑπήντησε (as in Luther—blieb Sitzen; or in v. Ess—tarried; as many explain it by the Heb. וַתֵּשֶׁב); more correctly de Wette, Kistemaker, Allioli—She sate in the house, and therefore heard not, and therefore came not. This ἐκαθέζετο describes her whole deportment during these days (Erasmus: *desidebat*)—it was varied only by an occasional visit to the grave, and not, as in the case of Martha, by other things. Thus did she this time not find the better part allotted—that of the sitting in sorrow, and giving heed to the condolences of friends.[2]

But let us return to the preliminary colloquy with Martha. Her obscure and indefinite saying, vers. 21, 22, vibrating between lamentation and hope, leads Him to utter the measured and concise answer of ver. 23, which, indeed, absolutely promises her brother's resurrection, but in a general future for the excitement of her faith. But when Martha evasively misunderstands and retreats, He gives her, in vers. 25, 26, a great, decisive, and penetrating declaration—not so much for application to her brother as to awaken her apprehension of that *now present* life which no death can destroy, and of the true *resurrection* in the inmost, spiritual meaning of the word; and *pre-eminently* to excite within her the faith that He in His own person is that resurrection and that life.

What Martha says in ver. 21, and Mary similarly in ver. 32, shows us what had been the main thought of these four days;

[1] But hardly, as Dräseke thinks, by a disciple hastening forward.

[2] Since, as Braune remarks, the condoling friends were received by the members of the family, sitting.

Hosted by Google

the thought to which all others led, and into which they returned from every other consideration. In the frank truth with which they present themselves before Jesus, the thought of their hearts is the first word upon their lips. "Alas, Lord—we have thought it and said it a hundred times since our brother died"—they must tell Him so as soon as they see Him. Neither of them says—*our* brother; for with all their sisterly communion, each had been individually and in isolation moved by this thought.[1] Thus does poor mortal man look back with *if* in all his heavy trials.[2] The dark mystery of His not coming, to whom they had sent the intelligence and their request, is afterwards expressed by Mary as the simple and sole outpouring of her heart; the less simple Martha, on the other hand, seems to be reflecting at once that the words might appear to involve a reproach directed against the Lord, or a murmuring at providence.[3] Not that she had indeed *thought* of any reproach or questioning, for she says nothing about *wherefore*, and not even—hadst Thou *come*. Of the message He had sent, she does not venture to think, much less to mention it. Did He err this time in His promise —"this sickness is not unto death!" Did He purpose to send the healing power with His word, and did it fail in coming? Such questions concerning the dread mystery had departed, had been fought away, by the time the fourth day came, so that only the question of ver. 21 remained; but now that she had said this in His presence, all those rise again to the quick thought of Martha, and she begins to be *careful* whether He might not so have understood her. Therefore, instead of letting Him speak, she herself continues (a venial unseemliness which Mary's ten-

[1] Martha's ἐτεθνήκει instead of Mary's ἀπέθανε may very well be genuine, in spite of the correction which would make them alike; for such a subtile variation (the force of which we can feel) is quite in harmony with sacred characterisation.

[2] It is wrong, however, to insinuate here a tone of vain wishing: Ah, hadst Thou—then might—! As in the London Heb. N. T. we find לוּ with ׃ following it.

[3] And it must be considered that the brother, as before observed, might have died before Jesus could have come, humanly speaking. On this supposition, there could not possibly have been any reproach involved; and nothing remains but pure lamentation that He had not been there (as Luthardt says, in opposition to Lücke). Still the lamentation has a tone which borders on the complaining question—Why was it so?

Hosted by Google

der nature could not have fallen into) and improves upon her own words. And all is perfectly true to the thoughts of her own heart. The sterling expression of great confidence in ver. 22, already seems to border on the Lord's own word, *πάντοτέ μου ἀκούεις* (ver. 42)—but Martha has not so elevated a meaning, she apprehends the *αἰτεῖν τὸν θεόν* in somewhat too human a sense (Bengel: verbum minus dignum), almost as if she did not yet recognise in Him the Son of God, like the man born blind in his similar words, ch. ix. 31.

But *what* does she really mean, that Jesus might ask and God would give? It is in vain to wish to remove from the words the hope of miraculous help, *even now* after her brother was dead.[1] Brandt's Bibel: "She thereby only intimates that her faith in Him, and in the special favour with which He was regarded by God, was not shaken by what had taken place. Note well this noble self-renunciation in her faith!" So that she merely meant to say,—Although Thou hast permitted my brother to die, and hast not this time done what we begged of Thee, yet I do not doubt on that account that Thou canst generally ask of God what Thou wilt? This would be a strange avowal, and we feel how artificial is such a connection with ver. 21, without any further refutation. Still more utterly objectionable is Fikenscher's notion that "there is here a continuation of the artless lamentation—Thou mightest have prayed for Lazarus at the right time, and have saved him!" All this is contradicted by the *ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν*. What shall we say then? Is it forbidden to refer these words to the possibility of the dead man's being raised, because Martha presently afterwards, in ver. 24 and again in ver. 39, has no presentiment of it? By no means. As she is suddenly bethinking herself to retract the reproach which might be implied in her words, and in so doing recalls the promise of ver. 4, *out of this* rises an instantaneous hope which brightens her susceptible thoughts: she utters her feeling at once, vague through timidity, yet strong enough;—but she scarcely herself knows what she says, in the sudden excitement of her fleeting presentiment. It is, as it were, a return to her earlier hopes before her brother's death, and she seems to forget in her confusion the *ἀπέθανε*.

[1] As *e.g.* Schleiermacher reads, against the literal words: If Thou hadst been here, God would have given Thee the life of our brother!

Hosted by Google

Yes, Martha is at this point a heroine in faith—but only for a moment, during the brief continuance of the involuntary presentiment which the Lord's presence had excited: the spark is soon all but extinguished, and the Lord begins to fan it again into life.

Ver. 23. We have fully expounded her long and wavering appeal, in order that the Lord's sublime and concise words in reply may be brought out in all the stronger relief. Schleiermacher's turning it to a *question*,—"Dost thou mean that thy brother is to rise again?" is passing strange, and not worth serious reflection. Ἀναστήσεται comes first, and then follows the sympathising ὁ ἀδελφός σου which *enters into* ver. 21. This, without further entering into her vague expression, is His sole lucid word, *His* first greeting, offered as soon as she gives Him opportunity. Could not Martha, if she received these words as an immediate answer, which they really were, fully understand what He designed to do, what He Himself thought of in so speaking? "Now, if thou dost ascribe this power to Me, I will καὶ νῦν ask that thy brother rise again!" He does not, indeed, say this; or even—I will awake him! Thinkest thou, then, that I cannot do this? or—Yea, verily, the Father giveth Me, as thou sayest, all that I ask! We feel the serene depth of the union of majesty and lowliness in the single ἀναστήσεται instead of all such words. Yes, John, thou hast drawn thy Christ to the very life!—I must confess that I do not share Alford's doubt: "I have to learn whether ἀναστήσεται in this direct absolute sense could be used of his *recall into human life*." And therefore "these words of our Lord contain no allusion to the *immediate* restoration of Lazarus; but are pædagogically used, to lead on to the requisite faith in her mind." But to me it appears that the meaning of the answer in ver. 25, coming home to the immediate present, requires the common interpretation,—that this awaking of *Lazarus* as an exceptional and typical case may well be termed a *resurrection*.

We very much doubt whether Martha speaks the words of ver. 24 as "doubting, inquiring, and hoping."[1] The great unquali-

[1] So Lange, and similarly the Berlenb. Bible: "She would give it to be understood that she would fain know whether the meaning of Jesus' words only pointed to that final day, and whether He would not also show His

Hosted by Google

fied word *rise again* is too strong for her thoughts to connect it with the *present;* she starts off and declines into the common faith and the common phrase—At the last day. She speaks "half susceptibly, half despondingly"—as Strauss for once well says. Her susceptibility to the Lord's meaning is in fault when she commits by a second οἶδα (a word in no case quite becoming in the presence of the διδάσκαλος) a yet greater impropriety than that which she had just repaired. "*This I well know*"—and even without Thy new assurance—is her answer to the sublime promise; as if the Master had only administered the current commonplace of consolation! "But what does this avail my life, now bereaved of my brother! It is long till then!" Lampe: "This is a very frequent infirmity of Christians, that they would selfishly wish to bring back their dead to the cares of this life, rather than leave them in the peaceful possession of nearer communion with God." Or it might be said: This is the weakness of immature faith, that it is unable to go beyond the limits of this short life; and that the consolation which can be brought from the last day into the present scenes of sorrow is but faint and unreal. We may indeed, with Lampe, find more excuse for Martha than for Christians of our day; remembering her Old-Testament position generally, and her expectation of the coming kingdom of Jesus—which she would distinguish from the ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. But it may be asked, Wherefore interpret her words in any evil sense? Why not understand them, "Yea verily, I do assuredly stay my soul upon this, that it hath pleased God and Thyself to permit my brother to die." But the οἶδα of *opposition* in them does not permit this. The Holy Ghost does certainly in this word of the most instructive narrative mark out a typical expression of that weakness of spirit which itself removes into the far distance the consolation of the Resurrection, and in the lamentation of bereavement declines to take comfort from it. And this requires us to regard the historical truth in her case as corresponding to such a type.[1]

power in a specific manner at the present time." Similarly Lampe, and almost in the same words. Neander also: "This I well know; but I wished to hear something else from Thy lips."

[1] Dräseke: "In the circumstances, this answer would be incomprehensible, if the incomprehensible heart of man did not make it intelligible.

Hosted by Google

Vers. 25, 26. *These words* are, probably speaking, the centre of the chapter and of the whole history; not the miracle of bodily resurrection, which indeed was to serve for the confirmation of this testimony in the mouth of Jesus, of this reiterated ἐγώ εἰμι, but for which, on the other hand, the Lord would fain have found a preparatory faith, grounded on the word already received.—The right apprehension of the *two clauses*, the remarkable interchangeable expression of which forbids us to regard them as tautological, depends, though this is too often overlooked, upon the right view of the *two words* which precede:—ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωὴ is, as it were, the theme, which is then unfolded in two parts. It is clear, at the outset, that the connection requires us first of all to understand bodily resurrection, for ver. 25 aims to surpass Martha's words in ver. 24: that which her languid faith refers to the distant futurity, so that its power of consolation is enfeebled, the Lord offers as in Himself for the immediate present; by His emphatic εἰμί, in the place of the future, and by the impressive question whether she believed *that*,[1] He excites and demands her present living faith in His own Person, as bringing that future time into the present, as making the *Then* no other than the *Now*. "As an answer to Martha the words have the reassuring meaning, I am his (thy brother's) awakener and give him his life again! as we find that He was his awakener, as the narrative goes on, and did actually give him his life again." (Hanstein.) But this meaning of the answer, as sufficing for Martha's immediate care, does not exhaust its meaning, as it involves a deeper principle upon which even her consolation was grounded; still less does it exhaust the depths of this great testimony as intended for all future faith in the speaker of these sublime words.

What relation, then, subsists between the one *double-idea resurrection* and *life?* We cannot say, with Lücke, that the ζωή is the positive *result* of the ἀνάστασις—for that is a too external

Half-faith always does what Martha here does. What one hand gives, the other takes back. What lies straight before it, is sought in the far distance."

[1] Christ here comes forward in the place of the living, life-giving God: comp. Deut. xxx. 20, where Luther probably mistranslates the הוּא חַיֶּיךָ; the Vulg. gives it plainly, Ipse est enim vita tua.

Hosted by Google

sense, even in the case of Martha, whose meaning was to be surpassed; but conversely, the Lord profoundly reveals the life existing in Himself and passing from Him to all believers, as the *cause* and sure *principle* of all resurrection. More correctly Olshausen, "the resurrection is no other than the ζωή in conflict with the θάνατος." Consequently, I am the resurrection, *because* I am the life; further, *as* I am the life, in the same most internally true, and already availing, sense. According to this alone can we distribute the progressive meaning of the two explanatory clauses; in which the Lord proceeds in such a manner as to appropriate *first* the common phraseology and view of *death*, in order *then* to exhibit all so-called death as abolished through His life in the case of all who believe on Him. We may thus embrace the two clauses, with Lange, providing we rightly understand and interpret: "The *dead* will live again, the *living* will never die." But we must be on our guard against narrowing and weakening the former clause! The extreme of this we may illustrate by the words of the paradoxical though generally orthodox Michael Weber, who maintained: The words ὁ πιστεύων—ζήσεται are not a commonplace, but contain a historical *reference to the dead Lazarus, the friend of Jesus;* thus—He thy dead brother, who believed in Me (for it is not said πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων, but ὁ πιστεύων without πᾶς) shall return to life (not in the last day, as thou didst think, but this very day)—; but the words which follow καὶ πᾶς ὁ ζῶν—εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα—, are not to be historically explained; they pertain to all the servants of Christ. Oh no; although there is some truth in this most immediate application to Lazarus, yet we feel that ὁ πιστεύων, even without the subsequent πᾶς, must be spoken in the same witnessing and promising sense throughout chs. v. and vi., the words of which are here, as it were, condensed into a compact epitome. (Ver. 26, especially, is an echo of ch. viii. 51.) How then explain this? The κἂν ἀποθάνῃ contains a condescending admission which is assuredly designed to testify that bodily death, the fruit of sin, is not altogether abolished even by the redeeming grace and victorious life of Christ; but the ζήσεται immediately penetrates much deeper in its preparatory reference to the second clause, being not merely one and the same with the first ἀναστήσεται in the place of which it now stands, any

Hosted by Google

more than the meaning of κἂν ἀποθάνῃ is to be restricted (as in Sepp) to—even if he *have died!* Thus we do not accord with the interpretation of Bengel, however attractive its semblance of profundity may make it: "The former deals with the case of believers *dying before the death of Christ;* for instance, Lazarus. The latter title treats of the case of believers falling asleep after the death of Christ. The death of Christ deprived death of its power. *Before the death of Christ, the death of believers was death;* after the death of Christ, the death of believers is not death."[1] For such an interpretation of the two distinctive periods of the Old and the New Testaments, and of the ἀνάστασις, as disclosed in all its fulness of meaning, and in all its power by the Lord's own death, is very far removed from the plain reference of these words in which Martha receives her answer; no such allusion is contained in the ἀνάστασις καὶ ζωή, and the εἰμί has assuredly no such mysterious ἔσομαι in its background. Still less can we distribute the meaning of the Lord's twofold assertion in the way which Klee adopts: "All have their life directly from Him, and as He *here imparts the life of time*, so there He will impart the life of eternal blessedness. The words obviously point to these distinctively. *Ver.* 25 *refers to life temporal. Ver.* 26 *to life eternal.*"

No, the former clause itself passes over, as we have said, into that same meaning of life which is alone its true and essential meaning; that in which the Lord speaks, in chs. v. and vi. as in all this gospel, of *life* in and from Himself, the fruit of His disciple's faith; and we may refer to all that is there said upon the relation between the temporal and the spiritual meaning of the word. It is not to be imagined that *Jesus* would here or anywhere give that name to a *mere* physical resurrection from death.

[1] He boldly added, "It is credible that *all* who at that time saw with faith Jesus Christ, and died before His death, were among those who rose again, as described in Matt. xxvii. 52, 53." We might with equal propriety extend this strange interpretation of the promise in ζήσεται (future, death having yet the dominion) to all who before the manifestation of Christ believed in Him as to come, and include their redemption from the kingdom of the dead; we might, similarly, extend it further to multitudes who have gone hence with a like *fides implicita* towards Christ, regarding the second clause as distinguishing from them all who in this life were raised to the full life of faith.

Hosted by Google

He that believeth in Me—this is His meaning—shall receive at once, in and through this faith, in Me, a life which death cannot invade and destroy; just as, and because, it will be demonstrated that I am *the life* by My conflict with death and victorious resurrection. It is not so much,—Even though he die, he shall *live* again; as,—He shall *live on*, he can never cease to live. On that account it is *ζήσεται* instead of *ἀναστήσεται*, and this *of itself* is a denial of the *ἀποθνήσκειν* even while the word is used; so that the true paradox runs thus,—*κἂν ἀποθάνῃ, οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ.* "He that believeth on Him, lives even if he dies; death touches not his inmost life, it has become a sleep (ver. 11); and he that liveth and *through faith in Him has been raised up to a new life* can no more be affected by death, *for he lives an eternal and imperishable life which death can do no more than sublimate and perfect.*" (v. Gerlach.)

In these excellent words we have, at the same time, the only correct interpretation of the ensuing *καὶ πᾶς ὁ ζῶν*, which, strangely enough, the same writer immediately tries to overturn when he says: "in the second half of the clause (*whosoever liveth*) Jesus turns to those *still in life* who were then hearing Him, with a mighty challenge, full of promise, to faith in Himself." The *ζῶν* of the second clause, which is founded upon that of the first, is ordinarily but improperly regarded as referring only to living upon earth in the common sense. So Augustin. Tract. xlix. Omnis qui vivit *in carne* et credit in me. Euthymius and Theophylact even referred it specifically to the surviving members of the family, in opposition to the already dead Lazarus; and de Wette thinks their explanation at least "not amiss." Then comes Grotius, who finds a Hebraism here: quisquis vivens (vitam hanc mundi scilicet) mihi confidet—as if the Old-Testament כָּל־חַי could be reproduced *here!* Alas, even Bengel takes the same view, misled by the semblance of strict antithesis (as is Alford too): "*that liveth*, namely, this present life of the body; the antithesis is, *even though he die*, ver. 25." But he has failed to perceive that the Lord, after He has gone beyond the *ordinary* meaning and use of the *ἀποθνήσκειν* by introducing *ζήσεται*, cannot possibly have returned again to the ordinary meaning and use of the *ζῆν*. Olshausen's remark is decisive, that if the *ζῶν* is to be understood of *physical* life, then ex antitheto the

Hosted by Google

meaning must be accepted that the believer should not physically die. So that Lücke is not justified in denying that ὁ ζῶν implies a continuous resumption of the meaning of ζήσεται. Lampe: Doubtless, the Lord here understands life of the same kind which had been spoken of before, that is, *spiritual* life. The never dying again *follows* directly from the possession of *this* life! The formula might be resolved into a ἓν διὰ δυοῖν: He that liveth through faith,[1] or he that *livingly believes;* still better, the καὶ may be taken as a retrogressive *because*, just as in the previous ἀνάστασις καὶ ζωή. All these reductions to our modern phraseology, however, correspond but imperfectly with the full expressiveness of the sayings in their original oriental-biblical form. The position of the πιστεύων in the *second* place might be regarded as implying the condition that he who had received life in the Lord must preserve his faith to the end; but we leave this to the reader's own feeling.[2] Suffice it, that he who *lives* in Jesus by faith hath in himself the principle of the ἀνάστασις, of the final victory over death; death must lose all its power and be abolished in him. He cannot and will not (as Lange says) "sink again into the essential ground of death"—or in more scriptural language: there is no Hades that can hold his spirit. (Acts ii. 24.)

In these words, "we hear, as it were, a prelude of our Lord's own resurrection." (Herder.) Thus speaketh He on the way to His own closely impending death! But He utters this ἐγώ εἰμι in perfect devotion to the πιστεύοντες; He promises also *to them* that which is sublimely self-understood in relation to Himself. Nothing distinctively appropriate to Lazarus is contained in the sayings of vers. 25, 26; the promise that he should rise again retires before a far higher and comprehensive truth to which the Lord would elevate the doubting, faltering Martha; He turns her attention from her brother lying in his grave to Himself, the present life-giver, the present resurrection of all who be-

[1] Theod. Mopsuest. ὁ ζῶν μετὰ τῆς εἰς ἐμὲ πίστεως.

[2] But when Luthardt says, in his frequently too rigorously literal style of criticism, that no expositor but Stier would find in the position of πιστεύων the condition of living in faith to the end, I may remark that Lange's interpretation of the second clause is essentially no other: "But in as far as *faith* has become effectual in his life" (only mine is more precise, faith has become his true life), "there is no more death possible to it." (iii. 656.)

Hosted by Google

lieve. Not, however, that she is to resign the hope of an immediate, present fulfilment of the promised *ἀναστήσεται ὁ ἀδελφός σου*—she is encouraged firmly to expect in faith towards Christ a most glorious realisation of *this* assurance. Hence the *οὐκ εἶπόν σοι* of ver. 40, points back to these words.

Believest thou *that?* That is, that *I am* the resurrection and the life? Then shall it be found true in the case of thy brother, who believing in Me, and as My "friend," has died! Her answer shows that Martha thus rightly understood the indescribably penetrating and mightily stimulating question. But we, when we read it, must think of the multitudes who avow and even preach that Jesus is the resurrection and the life, and who, nevertheless, properly speaking, *believe* it not, or only languidly believe it. It is for their sakes that the Lord here once for all uttered that gracious, but piercing and convicting question—*Πιστεύεις τοῦτο*; that it might for ever penetrate all such unbelieving hearts. His own resurrection has now put its profoundest emphasis upon this question. Thus, though no Lazaruses may be any longer raised up, and we are left at the grave to seek our consolation in the last day, yet the Lord gives us here to understand what is the true "*resurrection*," and shows that it is to be experienced in the new life of His believing saints. When the dead bury their dead, leave them at first to their cries and lamentations until the claims of that anguish are satisfied; and then let the voice of a preached Gospel sound into the sorrow, it may be to the awakening of the dead who are burying their dead. But when the living bury *His* living—nothing should be heard but resurrection-joy, no traces but of that should be left! *Should be*, only that our faith is often but too weak in the midst of the sorrows of death! It is for us to strengthen it for ever by the great truth—"I am the resurrection and the life!" the comforting power and the convincing force of which can never be sufficiently either expounded or felt. When the angel Jehovah at the burning bush called Himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the living God of all who had died in peace but who still lived to Him, that was indeed a great word, but it was spoken out of the darkness, and its assuring truth could burst forth into life only after the passing away of more than a thousand years. But here the great word in the lips of Jesus is

Hosted by Google

mightier still, and is spoken out of the light itself; for here stands that same covenant angel, the eternal Son as man in *our body*, on the way to die for us in the grave of humanity; and He graciously asks for our faith in His—*I am He!* All other grounds of immortality and longings for resurrection life receive their realised confirmation only in the firm faith in His person and His word—*I!* And here we gladly bring to mind the words of Ullmann, coming from the very heart of faith, where John Paul's saying, "were there no other, yet Christ is Providence!" is repeated and raised to higher grandeur—Were there no other, He must be the resurrection!

THE SEPULCHRE, THE STONE, FAITH, THE THANKSGIVING TO THE FATHER, THE RAISING.

(Ch. xi. 34, 39–44.)

Martha's answer, with its earnest, though only half understood confession, may be compared with that of Simon Peter (ch. vi. 69); there is something more of evasion, however, in her case, since she does not understand the "living though he die," and the "never dying," even so well as Peter did the words which had been spoken concerning the flesh and blood of the Son of man going up again into heaven. In both instances, meanwhile, the gist of the confession is,—Even that which I cannot understand must nevertheless be quite true, for one thing is quite certain to me, that Thou art the Son of God! As the man who had been blind promised Jesus beforehand that he would believe on the Son of God, because he already more than suspected Jesus to be He—so do such souls as Peter's and Martha's believe (in their several way) beforehand in that *eternal life* of which the words of Jesus speak, without comprehending all at once the when, the where, the how, or the secrets of God's power in the *resurrection* which precedes. The first *yea* of Martha, consequently, is spoken with absolute subjective truth, although she does not know that she is uttering it very much as the disciples did in Matt. xiii. 51. Indeed, Martha does no more believe in the full meaning of the τοῦτο of the

Hosted by Google

Lord's question, than the disciples there understood all that He had been saying to them; but the ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός which she avows instead, admits and includes all that He would testify and do as such. She marks out His person in her confession by the three several predicates which were known to her;[1] to the general popular term by which the Jewish expectation was expressed, she adds the declaration which was but obscurely if at all apprehended by the Scribes and learned of the day, that that Christ was also the Son of God; and both are conclusively supplemented by the ὁ ἐρχόμενος of expectation now fulfilled. This is not, indeed, as Luther has it,—Who is come (Vulg. venisti); but as always,—Who was to come; yet the σὺ εἶ includes His having come, and hence Erasmus gives it best,—qui venturus *erat*. It is not now that she begins to believe all this; but the πεπίστευκα means actually that conviction which the Lord knew she had long felt, and which prompted the *first* κύριε of ver. 21, although then in ver. 22 her hesitation had not permitted her to use τὸν πατέρα instead of τὸν θεόν.[2]

And now she is prepared; she pauses not in contemplation, evidently has no repose of mind for any longer continuance in such high words and things. Quasi re bene gesta she becomes Martha again; she bethinks herself of the propriety of summoning her sister, forgotten before in the hurry of her going forth to meet the Lord, and expresses that snmmons as if it was a direct commission from the Master. We by no means think, with most people, that Jesus had actually spoken any such words (Pfenninger: "Where is thy sister?"), for St John would have related it. But she thinks, what the Master now speaks is rather

[1] "Her fervour and energy of mind had brought at once into combination all that was said concerning the Saviour, all the three tokens and signs of His character." Braune. This is quite true. Luthardt (i. 122) imputes *to me* the exposition, that Martha would swiftly despatch the matter, and therefore said at once all that she could say, *not* tarrying in the believing contemplation and adoration of the person of Jesus; but this is one instance among many of his own habit of swiftly despatching his notice of my meaning. Where have I said this?

[2] Hezel, who understood by the last day of ver. 24, "the Messianic period after the termination of the Mosaic," would thence prove that that period had been still far in the future to Martha, and therefore again that she had hitherto not regarded Jesus as the Messiah!

Hosted by Google

for my sister[1]—and regards His presence and His thus speaking as an indirect calling for that disciple who had been so peculiarly susceptible to His instructions. *Therefore* we have now διδάσκαλος instead of κύριος.[2] She calls her secretly, in order to prevent the concourse of Jews, who were in part opposed to Jesus, and whose presence certainly would be, in her estimation, an interruption. *Mary* came *quickly;* and this is mentioned only in her case (without altogether denying it, however, of Martha's ὑπήντησεν), because the double fact, that Jesus was there, and that He had to send for her, gave wings to Mary's haste. Jesus remained without, He had not at once gone, nor did He now go into the house of mourning, nor even into the village; He would doubtless avoid encountering at once the multitude of guests; but did not aim, as Hess assumes, to secure as much privacy as possible for the performance of the intended miracle. For He well knows that Lazarus is in his grave, and that many comforters would be there, the inevitable witnesses of the resurrection. Consequently, we prefer saying with G. Müller, that, "at the raising of Lazarus, He seemed to make it His aim, for the satisfaction of all the demands of His enemies, to perform this most wonderful of all His miracles in the most public manner possible."[3] Comp. ver. 42. And in this both ancient and modern expositors concur. "He repaired immediately to the neighbourhood of the *grave*," as Lange tells us, deducing this rightly from the circumstance that in ver. 31 the Jews understand Mary's way to Him to be her way to the grave. And if anything is perceived in this contrary to the

[1] She cannot sustain the force of this great declaration. It is too much for her. Then began she to find her need of her hitherto forgotten sister. Mary must hear this. It was for her above all others. Dräseke.

[2] "They have no other Master; and this friend of the family is thus sufficiently designated." Braune. Ita solebant inter se loqui de Jesu. Bengel. Here again I am at one with Luthardt, although he charges upon me the idea that it was *merely* in allusion to the previous distinctive relation of Mary to Jesus as hearing His words, that διδάσκαλος is used. This is doing me injustice.

[3] Vom Glauben der Christen, i. 401. Dräseke derives the same from Jesus' own word—I go that I may awake him; and adds, "The Hero cannot be absent from the scene of his exploits."

Hosted by Google

custom which required that the mourners should be visited in the house, it makes the specific design all the more obvious, and this is the meaning of ver. 30.

The miserable comforters will not allow the poor bent mourner to weep as heretofore, alone at the grave; they persecute her, as it were, with their unfeeling presence and sympathy. And she herself has no other word for Jesus at first than her sister's;[1] but more simple than Martha, *she* adds no apologetic reflection to the expression of their common grief and perplexity; instead of that *she* falls in full devotion at His feet, which says much more than Martha's hastily satisfied reflections; she understands her own words in a much deeper sense—"Yea, verily, where Thou art no man can die!" It goes to her very heart that He should have had to send and summon her, and this it is which throws her in the profoundest lowliness of dependence at His feet.

Ver. 34. The simple word here spoken by our Lord springs, according to St John's report, from a strong emotion, the precise definition of which has given great trouble to the expositors, and especially to those who are themselves deficient in that penetrating sympathy with the occasion which alone leads to a right understanding. We must not shrink from a close inspection of this *ἐνεβριμήσατο*. All whom Jesus now sees around Himself are weeping—good and bad, friends and enemies—for the sadness of death overpowers them all.[2] But it was when He saw *Mary also* weeping that the measure of overpowering influence upon even the Son of God in the flesh was full—what an exquisite feature in the picture is this! Of what nature, then, is His emotion? *Βριμάζω, βριμαίνω, βριμάομαι, βριμόομαι,* all from *βρίμη* (power, strength, anger, threatening) signify in their derivative meaning, to be angry, to rebuke, to threaten, to express vehemently, quite corresponding with the Latin *fremere*. Hence *ἐμβριμᾶσθαι* here assuredly indicates a *gravis animi com-*

[1] Luthardt adds, "it is probably not immaterial that *μοῦ* is placed first in her words, while in ver. 21, on the other hand, it is only appended to *ἀδελφός*."

[2] Thou art ashamed to *weep* beforehand at the thought of thy own coming grave; but would not that be better, more profitable, and more sincere than merely the common weeping with those who weep?

Hosted by Google

motio, which it is vain to require our understanding *in sensu molliore*. Vulg. infremuit; but the Heb. New Test. incorrectly וַיֶּאָנַח. (In Isa. xvii. 13 for נצר Symm. has *ἐμβριμᾶσθαι*, Aquila *ἐπιτιμᾷν*, —in Ps. xxxviii. 4 for זעם both have *ἐμβρ.* In New Testament see Matt. ix. 30; Mark i. 43, xiv. 5.) Since, however, anger, at this time of general weeping, appears hardly consonant with our Lord's character, recourse has been had to a subordinate meaning, "to mourn;" and Olshausen precipitately declares this sufficiently established by its correspondence as to this twofold meaning with the Hebrew זעף! This last may be true (see Tholuck) in itself, but it decides nothing as to the Greek usage; since we cannot find in the LXX. *ἐμβριμᾶσθαι* used for sorrow, though we do find in Lam. ii. 6 *ἐμβριμήματι ὀργῆς* for בְּזַעַם־אַפּוֹ. The old Greek expositors of St John understood in mass no other than the being angry; Lücke admits this invariability of the usage, although he afterwards decides for "a *sadness* bordering on displeasure." We agree with Lampe, who condemns the multitudes of expositors whom Grotius represents, "who *confound this* indignation of our Lord with His *tears*"—and maintains his own well-grounded protest, sed obstat constans verbi usus. For the word was never regarded by the old standard lexicographers as having the twofold meaning of anger or sorrow; and this may be observed beforehand against Lange's opinion. Thus, vehementer indignatus est. Strauss in this case is quite right, It is an emotion of anger and not of grief. But wherefore? Not because of the enmity of the Jews who flocked round according to the petty interpretation of Michaelis, Storr, and Kuinoel, who seem not to have read the *ὡς εἶδεν* of ver. 33. Nor is He angry with the weepers because they weep in their weakness, for that is opposed to the gentle love which always accompanies our Lord's majesty; and hence we find no *αὐτοῖς* added. Cyril and Euthymius (see in Lücke) referred it to an internal process of self-conflict, in which the Lord vehemently repelled and suppressed the strong sympathy of His human nature which disturbed Him. But *τῷ πνεύματι* is not to be taken as a dative, marking the *πάθος* which the Lord rebuked; for this would be to oppose the meaning of the word *πνεῦμα* and to forget the parallel *ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν*. Nor can we by any means understand that the emotion which our Lord might suppress, could be the

Hosted by Google

pure and holy sympathy of grief. We trace, however, in these ancient attempts to find the object of this displeasure in Jesus Himself, the right clue to that meaning which alone we regard as the true one. And that is *almost* the same (for in the definition of deep feelings individual expressions are not easily adjusted) with Lange's view, which corrects his former opinion:[1]—a strong feeling of voluntary counteraction to the mighty influence upon Himself of the tumultuous scene of sorrow. But Lange should have said (what others also omit) that Bengel was upon the same track.[2] It is assuredly something akin to a temptation, which springs from the mere lamentation over unconquerable death around Him, and would almost hurry Him away; for He must be regarded as carrying His sympathy with every human impulse, even to the very extreme edge of what was lower than Divine. Thus it is not over the weeping of these weepers alone that He is moved and incensed in His inmost being, where Divine thoughts and impulses take the form of human ideas and feelings—but over human misery generally as at that time exhibited, over the bitter death-lamentation of a world of sinners, but especially, as scarcely needs to be asserted, over that essential misery in misery, death in death,—*sin*, and that as specifically here, *unbelief*, which will not and cannot apprehend any resurrection at all, yea, the same unbelief in His beloved believing ones, and even of His most beloved *Mary!* Brückner properly says, "It is the holy indignation of the Redeemer, misapprehended by His enemies, and misunderstood by His friends." This must be included, though the central emotion was *sorrow* on account of *sin*, and wrath against *death* as the wages of sin. Luthardt (S. 217) not only coincides on this point with Besser, but even with myself; why then should he oppose what obviously belongs to the truth which he admits, the displeasure at

[1] In the fourth volume of his miscellaneous works. He there decided for a mixture of anger and sorrow; justifying the former, and approximatively interpreting the whole aright. His finding sorrow in the ἐμβριμᾶσθαι was contrary to the genius of the language.

[2] On ver. 33. "Thus it was that, by a more severe affection of the mind, Jesus here restrained His tears, and presently after, ver. 38, broke off His tears; and, by that very fact, the influence produced by them was greater." On ver. 38. "By this groan Jesus *also* repelled the Jews' gainsaying, *lest it should tempt His own mind.*"

Hosted by Google

Mary's unbelief and the blindness of His foes? Much various emotion is involved, indeed, in the depths of our Lord's sensibility at this time. How much more profoundly than that of man does it penetrate the *principles* and reasons of emotion! Again, He is not so much indignant at the horrors of death as something alien to Himself and confronting Him from without; but His holy wrath is called up by the *sympathy* by which He at the same time as man stands within the sphere of this humanity. Thus must we interpret, not this crisis simply, but the whole conflict and victory of the Son of God in His weak, tempted flesh: this is the truth lying at the foundation of the exposition which makes ἐμβριμᾶσθαι to mean sympathy. If that which excited His indignation did not so closely and intimately press upon Himself, why the passion of repelling vehemence? But the fellow-feeling with such misery is presupposed; St John's words give only "the resentment of the power of death"—as seen, too, in unbelief of the glory of God! Thus, as Lange saw at first, in the background wrath against Him, who holds this power of death over man! That here, according to Kling, "sacred indignation and most inward sympathy coexist," that He, according to Pfenninger, was "moved deeply and with indignation," must assuredly be understood. This rather than B.-Crusius' question, "Is it not according to analogy that sympathy should precede active communication of help?" For the Godman cannot be thought to have been angry at wickedness otherwise than as that anger was connected with that grief of His sympathising, redeeming heart of which Mar. iii. 5 is the normal text. This intermingling of emotion is attested in Lu. xix. 41–44, and in our present passage by the tears which afterwards flow.

It is in this feeling and passion,[1] into which the Lord is moved, even while He voluntarily and consciously surrendered Himself to it,[2] that He asks the question, *Where have ye laid him?* The

[1] Our readers will not require us to defend further the position, that (according to Rothe's Ethik 1, 303), "an instantaneous pathological passion might find place even in connection with the most perfect normal moral development."

[2] For this is the subtile modification of St John's ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν; admitting whatever measure of truth there is in the old orthodoxy which denied any mere passivity to the Godman.

Hosted by Google

traces of the emotion which accompanied this were visibly and physically to be seen; but the Evangelist explains to us what He really was τῷ πνεύματι. Either the Lord does not know the specific Ποῦ of the sepulchre, which is not supposable after what has been said, or the question was designed to announce beforehand what He had determined to do. Assuredly the latter, although He was not so understood; and this anew excites His indignation. He does not say, the body; but αὐτόν (just as ver. 15), in order to intimate the continuous unity of the man in body and soul even after death, confirming, in spite of all sophistry, this natural mode of expression.

Now first the *come and see!* bids the hitherto pent up *tears* overflow; now first does indignation against the γενεὰ ἄπιστος, and the power of death which would seize even His own spirit, resolve itself into the gentler *sorrow*. This ἐδάκρυσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς has been made a verse of itself, with the pause of סֶלָה after it![1] St John also has given the clause its isolated position; this and nothing else befel, on His part while going to the sepulchre, the Raiser went on His way weeping. The *sorrow* of this lamentation over death has its divine propriety in this, for death is the wages of sin. That marvellous orthodoxy which would make Jesus weep merely as an example needs scarcely to be mentioned even in warning.[2]

Vers. 36, 37 exhibit a twofold influence upon the Jews of the sight of Jesus weeping—a better and a worse. The one part errs half in good-nature; the other with an admixture of malignity. That He had loved him, is indeed true; and ver. 36 gives us a beautiful funeral text at the grave of the friends of Jesus, encouraging us to place His love to the deceased above our own. And we may more truly say: How did He love all us men, when He could be angry and weep at our unbelief in His gift and grace! Ver. 37 must be more closely observed. Strauss captiously asks, why they say nothing about earlier restorations to life; and the answer which lies most immediate

[1] Although it would be very incorrect to say, as Nonnus does here, that Jesus very seldom wept—ὄμμασιν ἀκλαύτοισιν ἀήθεα δάκρυα λείβων.

[2] Basil. M. hom. de gratiarum actione (Opp. II. p. 29): οὐκ ἐμπαθὲς ἦν τὸ δάκρυον τοῦ κυρίου, ἀλλὰ διδασκαλικόν. Dräseke, on the contrary: When His eyes thus overflowed, the Son of God was, in the fullest sense, Man.

Hosted by Google

is this—Those were Galilæan reports, and not so firmly established in the faith of the Jews as the recent healing of the blind man in Jerusalem. Further, no man ever ventured to demand of Him a resurrection from the dead; even Martha and Mary, who must have heard of former instances, dare not hope this for their brother—now four days dead! and surely we cannot attribute to the unbelieving Jews more faith than theirs. Teschendorff goes too far when he says, "they interjected their hissings, just like the serpent which leaves its venom even on beautiful flowers;" but we certainly perceive the traces of malignity in these perverse reflections. They cannot imagine any help now after death; but on that very account their objection (which is the open expression of what Martha and Mary kept in the background) goes back to a former time, and asks wherefore He should allow matters to reach this extremity in the case of those whom He loved. Wherefore did He not so order matters that this man should not die? And now He is constrained to pour forth tears at the grave! The first and most rational thought would be, He must have willed this, loving him so much; therefore in this case He *could* not effect it, this sickness passed His power! But instead of uttering these first reflections, which are to be taken for granted, they give expression to another springing from them, and which leads them astray:—To open the eyes of a man blind from birth is more[1] than the cure of any kind of sickness—*ought not this man to have been able?* And this would have a twofold meaning: either involving a reproach of neglect, or (as, since Euthymius, it has been generally understood) that they speak εἰρωνευόμενοι and mock His impotence, ἀδυναμία. Klee, holding this latter meaning, says, "They designed thereby to bring that other miracle upon the blind man also into doubt; if He could not save this man, what may we not think about the healing of the blind man?" This would be, in genuine irony, the perfect reverse of what they say; but such intense bitterness, in the midst of universal weeping, seems to us to be psychologically inappro-

[1] Lücke, correctly: "in fact, ver. 37 should be rather an argument *a majori* than *ad majus*." But we cannot so easily admit the reference to their regarding the excitation of an apparently dead man, a case frequently occurring, as less than opening the eyes of the blind.

Hosted by Google

priate; and the reference to this utterance of the Jews seems to us more certainly to be a supplementary testimony to the truth of that admitted miracle.[1] Finally, ver. 27 might be regarded as a well-meaning but feeble echo of vers. 21 and 32, Alas, if He had come, if He had been here at the right time! Wherefore *could* He not, or *should* He not (in the mysterious adjustments of God) have been here with His timely help? But this suits not the rigorously interrogatory form in connection with the striking ἠδύνατο, nor the contrasted τινὲς δὲ, which seems to be intended as ἄλλοι δὲ elsewhere.

Ver. 39. Suffice it that this superficial interpretation of His tears, shed not merely over Lazarus, and the unbelief connected with it—this οὐκ ἂν ἐτεθνήκει, οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανε, now become the third time ἵνα μὴ ἀποθάνῃ, nothing but death and the indissoluble bonds of death in the thoughts of all—excites in the Lord yet another emotion of displeasure rising above sorrow.[2] Thus prepared by these blended and alternate emotions,[3] He reaches the sepulchre; rather, εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, that is, He advanced into the interior, broad opening of the great cave, in the narrow background of which the corpse lay, concealed by a stone laid before it. The human *shuddering* at that death which by Him was to be overcome, being put into His power; perfect sympathy with that anxiety of the sorrow of His most believing and most beloved friends, against which their faith in Him has to struggle; deep indignation at the perversion and folly of those opposed to Himself; all this had occupied His mind, to such extent as it was possible for His soul to be so

[1] Thus did I plainly express myself. Yet Luthardt opposes Stier's notion that these Jews did not acknowledge that cure and the miraculous power of Jesus! Why did he read so cursorily, and attribute to me an opinion which I quote only to reject?

[2] Schleiermacher, indeed, thinks, "that the Redeemer was too much engrossed in His own thoughts, and the deeply mysterious connection of the event which was about to take place with the Divine plans, to pay much heed to the remarks which were being uttered around Him!" Oh no, the Lord was never so entirely wrapped up in His own thoughts; even on the cross He gives heed to every word and every movement around Him.

[3] Weeping and anger alternated in the bosom of Jesus at the sepulchre of Lazarus, within the space of a few moments. Kleuker.

Hosted by Google

occupied: Then said He—*Take ye away the stone!*[1] What majestic *composure*, and self-possession in the midst of this mighty emotion! Step by step He approaches gradually the great act, in order to qualify the amazement of poor mortal eyes on beholding the glory of God. He *might* indeed have Himself commanded the stone to roll itself away, as a mountain or a fig-tree; He might even have commanded Lazarus to come forth through the impediment of the stone. But the miracles of God avoid with the supremest propriety all that is superfluous. "What men's hands might remove, He commands *them* to take away." In His dignity He had let the confused remarks pass in silence, as previously the words of Thomas concerning dying with Him; but now shall the act itself speak and give answer whether it was the death of His friend alone that had made Him weep, and whether He could or could not succour him from death.

Among the Apostles a presentiment doubtless arose of what was now coming; Mary assuredly understood for what and how He would take away *the stone* from death and the sepulchre. It was only the careful Martha, ever anxious about circumstances, who could blindly suppose that He only desired to see the body once more: therefore she opposes to the Lord the frightful idea of its corruption. We leave those who are so disposed to contend whether this ἤδη ὄζει was merely the supposition of Martha (the following γάρ being thought decisive), or a historical intimation of the effluvium which actually penetrated through the stone. Certainly we cannot permit ourselves to adopt in the translation the words of Stolz, "By this time he assuredly stinketh!" We shall not enter into the needless question whether the revivification of a decomposed body would give to the miracle a *monstrous* character, as Olshausen thinks; nor examine Lange's positive assurance[2] that the Lord on this occasion had designedly suspended the process of decay. We cannot be

[1] "With what tone, we may imagine"—says Br. Baur, mockingly, on account of the indignation. Yes, indeed, we can imagine, but very differently from this frenzied mocker.

[2] Who thinks, with many, that the ointment of chap. xii. had been designed for the embalming, which had been left unaccomplished.

Hosted by Google

assured whether Lazarus stank or not;[1] but this we do know, that the power of God in Christ, which at the last day will bring together all the scattered members of the body, would at this time not pause before the slight commencement of decomposition. Thus we best adhere to the simplicity of the Gospel narrative, without in any way confusing the economy of the Son with that of the Father, who might be regarded as alone the *Creator:* for in every miracle God doeth a new thing (Numb. xvi. 30), so that the pretended limits are quite indefinite to our view.[2]

Ver. 40. "Graciously, and yet with some slight displeasure," the Lord speaks (as Pfenninger thinks) this word, which now takes the place of His tears. Once more He is moved, though more gently; and now gives His own explanation, and in the most condescending manner, of the predominant reason of His anger. It is the *unbelief* of even His believing followers while under the ban of visible *death!* He had said that faith should behold the glory of God, especially in ver. 26, so also in ver. 23, and yet further back in ver. 4. The expression δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ is derived from this last quotation, and the Lord's words mean, generally,—Have I not told thee from the very beginning, promised thee again and again! But by this repetition the simple clause becomes a new, great universal truth and promise

[1] It is to us, however, more probable "that the Evangelist reports the cause as it really was, making Martha's statement his own"—quoting the language of Br. Bauer for once, who on this chapter generally gives full scope to his harebrained malignity. De Wette regards it as in the highest degree improbable that the body *was not embalmed*, considering the eminence of the family and the provision for the purpose actually existing in the house; but it seems to us natural enough, when we remember the hope which had been entertained to the last, and the prostrating revulsion of grief afterwards. For this reason we cannot think, with Lange and Luthardt, that the ointment (chap. xii. 3) had been bought for Lazarus; nor that the embalming had been deferred from day to day till Jesus should come. Was Jesus to confirm the actuality of death? or did they *expect* the ensuing resurrection? Assuredly not! Vers. 21, 22, refute all these suppositions.

[2] Thus the "difference between the new-creating resurrection at the last day and the actual vivification of the old mortal body" (which Luthardt blames me for overlooking), is not so rigid and definite, but that this singular and pre-eminent instance might anticipate in some sense, and be an example of the former.

Hosted by Google

—that, everywhere and always, faith, especially in the presence and amid the tokens of death, shall see the glory of God! What an inexhaustible, all-comprehensive text is this for the preacher! The great condition, as it is here laid down first, is, and must ever be, faith. Unbelief, even that which, alas, still more or less clings to unbelievers, but especially unbelief in its absolute sense, *seeth* indeed something, but only what comes before its bodily eyes. It may be that it sees only the wretchedness of man's human life, and that horror of death which ends it with presentiment of something worse;—or, still worse, turning wilfully away from that view of things, it may contemplate the glory of the flesh, as if it would never fade, the glory of the world, as if it were a reality and not a delusion;—or, worst of all, it may fix its proud regard upon *its own* imagined glory and might. And yet, what is all this but the *stone*, which falls at last crushing upon the grave and the poor spirit within; the stone which Christ alone can remove. But faith already *sees*, after the manner of its own higher, and more assured seeing, something beyond all this, even the glory *of God:* and that in a manifold sense. First of all, even that glory of the Creator which is still upon and in the world, the ἀΐδιος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης which is yet to be seen in spite of sin and death—the token and prophecy that the ban and curse is not irremediable, that the kingdom of death is not absolute upon the earth. (Wisd. i. 14.) Then, as faith in Him who is come, it sees the glory of the Redeemer, of Christ in His kingdom, His church, and His spreading Gospel. This, indeed, goes beyond, it is no other than an actual ἀνάστασις of the spirit into life which everywhere conquers and banishes death. And this seeing faith has the promise of exceeding greater things; of beholding and experiencing that final quickening and glorification unto victory, נֶצַח (Isa. xxv. 8), of which the restoration of Lazarus from the grave was but a slender pledge. But the *sure foundation* for such faith is after all no other than *His word.* Is it not enough that *He hath said it?* And in His love how often has He spoken it: after every minor and preparatory fulfilment pointing back to His own words, to shame and elevate His weak servant—*Did I not* say unto thee?—But how deeply rooted in us is unbelief! Was it possible that the Raiser of Lazarus could re-

Hosted by Google

main in His own grave? Yet did not He, who predicted His own rising again on the third day, find it needful to demonstrate in His own case the truth of His own reproving question? They none of them believed, John no more than Thomas. (Ch. xx. 9.) Yet He rose again among them and for them; and from this we learn that the condition ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς is not so rigorously intended: but the beginner and finisher of our faith strengthens, rewards, and consummates the weakest faith which He beholds.

Thou shalt see the glory of God; that is, with joy, for thyself —for in the end even unbelief *must see*, though only to its guilt and condemnation, even as the Lord's enemies see with their own eyes the miracle wrought upon Lazarus. In the most immediate sense, notwithstanding its profound prospective reference onwards to the last day (ver. 24), the δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ is here, as in Lu. ix. 43, used in the sense of μεγαλειότης; compare, in Ex. xvi. 7, the same expression used for the revelation of the might of His unshortened arm. The glory of God is that power which victoriously protests against every appearance upon which unbelief has fixed its eye: in the present case against the conviction of the dead man's *corruption*, as expressed by Martha in words which may serve as the protest of men's senses everywhere against the resurrection.[1]

"He whose mind is biassed against the narratives of miracles in the Gospels, and generally in the Bible, would regard this as a good opportunity for Jesus to put an end once for all to the faith which rests on signs and wonders; instead of calling back a dead man to life, He might more profitably have occupied the company with pious discourse upon death and life, time and eternity, and have thereby annihilated the hopes of all who, then as afterwards, might demand miracles as evidence." (Hess.) But not so! He performs the miracle as a testimony; He stoops to the weakness of existing faith, or to excite faith where it existed not, and gives a "rehearsal of the great scene," when all the "corrupted members of humanity shall again be reconstructed in perfect harmony." (Kleuker.)

[1] B.-Crusius: "The word of Jesus in ver. 40 stands in opposition to the Jewish (wherefore merely *Jewish?*) abhorrence of the grave and its contents. Here there is no revelation of death, but a Divine revelation of power to be expected."

Hosted by Google

Vers. 41, 42. But in connection with this last great public miracle the Lord utters a declaration which holds good of all His miraculous acts,—intimating, first, their proper design to lead men to believe in His person and mission; and then giving instructions as to the instrumental means by which He acts in the power of God. It is not as the ancient dogmatic, and the opinion of many of the pious concurring with it, think:—that the man Jesus accomplishes His wonderful works in the immediate possession of almightiness; but He performs them, like man, through prayer and faith. This alone is in harmony with His state of humiliation; and the difference between the miraculous working of others both before and after Him and His own, consists in this, that He alone is absolutely and supremely full of faith, and always heard as the Son of the Father. "He did, indeed, effect all His miracles in faith, but in that faith which was quite peculiar to Himself, as being the Son of God manifest in the flesh." (Rieger.) Kleuker, after having so profoundly spoken of "the Son of God and of man," nevertheless embarrassed himself by saying (Mensch. Versuch, S. 238): "Jesus did not pray for an impartation of higher strength from heaven, for *where He was, there was the Father*, and all life and power: but He prayed, that they might believe that He was sent of God." Oh no, He did here, as well as in all His miracles (comp. Mar. vii. 34, and our exposition), pray the Father that He might now make manifest in Him and by Him His power. Indeed, *this* prayer of Jesus in its sacred mysteriousness was never audible to man, many times it is presupposed and wrapped up in His instant word of power. And, generally speaking, every *petition* of the Son to the Father—apart from His youth-development, and the first and last conflict (in which He yet more profoundly empties Himself)—must be regarded as rather an expression of *thanksgiving* for being certainly heard already. So here, it is not now that He prays; but, in His supreme dignity and truth, thanks His God for the hearing of the prayer which must be placed as far back, it may be, as ver. 4. He had received even then the answer from the Father as to the issue of this sickness.[1] The supposition

[1] Hence we cannot, with Albertini, term this, which is no longer supplication, a "heaven-enforcing prayer."

Hosted by Google

which some have most erroneously hazarded, who connect this present thanksgiving with the Lord's observation of Lazarus' life when the stone was removed,[1] is protested against at once by the words which immediately follow, by the ἤδειν and the Evangelist's declaration that the Lord refers to His prayer and thanksgiving for the people's sake alone. In order that they might not, beholding the omnipotence of God thus exhibited in His wonderful work, idolatrously *worship* Him, thinking Him man, "as a God" (see our remarks on ch. x. 34–36)—He himself prays as man to God, and gives as the Son to the Father His honour. This was a testimony, prominent and conclusive, given to Him before His final sufferings; and therefore the ὄχλος περιεστώς is not sent away, as in the case of the *first* raising from the dead. For all things have their time and order.

It is with difficulty that we condescend to the unfounded objection which has been urged against the *praying for the sake of the hearers*—an objection which Strauss, an incompetent critic in anything which concerns prayer, has carried to its highest point of offensiveness.[2] Our Lord's declaration, that He thus prayed and gave thanks on account of the people, has, alas, always been more or less repulsive to many:—a sure sign how few are able to place themselves with simplicity in the position from which our Saviour's life can be profoundly understood. Dieffenbach even resorted to the expedient of supposing an

[1] Being embarrassed by something like the opinion of those whose theory here is that of a seeming resurrection:—He now saw that Lazarus was not dead, and that He could "awake" him in the presence of the people!! Chrysostom and Lampe, with others, assume the revivification to have taken place before the εὐχαριστῶ σοι, but this we must reject. Alford rightly regards this as "highly improbable;" and, referring to ch. v. 25, 28, regards ἀκούσαντες ζήσονται as being the physical as well as the spiritual order of things.

[2] To him, such prayer of cold accommodation (as he chooses to term it), such an *acting* of prayer, is repulsive and hateful: and so we suppose would be the most internal prayer of the solitary child; for what does he understand of praying, to whom every address to God as independent of the spirit of man must be an offence? Br. Bauer outdoes his predecessor, babbling here of a "prayer which explodes in irony upon itself," and other monstrosities, not here to be quoted, which carry enmity against St John's Gospel to its most fearful excess!

Hosted by Google

interpolation. Lücke, who does not scruple to regard the addition ἐγὼ δὲ ᾔδειν as a reflection of St John, and seizes this opportunity assiduously to vindicate such half-unbelieving views of the Evangelists' composition, admits that praying aloud in no case excludes reference to the edification of others. This incontrovertible commonplace requires no confirmation to the minister, who feels in all his liturgical prayer the propriety and obligation of keeping this reference in view; nor even to the Christian priest in his household who prays in the presence of his children and dependents. Lange speaks with much dignity and felicity upon this point, showing how much the critics are below the height of this prayer, and that perfect filial supplication, being without all restrained and vehement inwardness and exclusiveness, may in its simplicity reflect externally upon the present hearer. Did not the Lord pour out the prayer of ch. xvii. to the Father, with a view to the disciples who should hear it?[1] Did not the Father Himself, ch. xii. 28, 30, answer the Son—not for His own sake, but for the sake of the people?

But the real element of difficulty in this application, one which de Wette thinks "must be acknowledged," lies in this, that the Lord Himself says it in His prayer to the Father—I pray for the sake of the people! But we must reply that in this is exhibited the transcendent simplicity and truth of Him who had become man for us, who lived, who taught, who worked, who prayed for us; so that not only was the "for you!" of His whole life never in any opposition with any "for Me," but according to the very nature of His *mission* He is constrained to give perpetual testimony to this. And this extends far beyond the analogy of the priest in the household praying in the presence of his family! In the high-priestly prayer, ch. xvii. 13, the Lord utters before His disciples the same express declaration—that He *spake* His prayer for their sakes—which He now utters before the people.[2]

[1] So that this of ch. xi. is not to be regarded as "the only public prayer of Jesus."

[2] Thus it is certainly not to do away with an objection, that I would follow Münchmeyer's counsel to explain artificially (with Baumgarten-Crusius and others, which he does not add), as if in εἶπον an earlier supplication were referred to: For the sake of the people I uttered the request!

Hosted by Google

And what a crisis was this, for the establishment of the appeal to the Father in the presence and for the sake of the people!—bringing to mind Elijah on Carmel, praying to be heard, "*that this people may know* that Thou, Lord, art God!" (1 Kings xviii. 37.) But how much more important this moment! "The sign here to be given was to decide upon the truth of His life, as far as concerned the circle around Him"—says Lange. Hanstein, yet more strongly: "Then stood collective humanity waiting in spirit at the grave of Lazarus. And the great question—whether God would hear or would not hear His only begotten, whether He would authenticate or desert the work of Christ, whether He would confirm or bring to nought His once-uttered word—must *here* be decided!" Rhetorical, indeed, but founded upon truth; for in the ὄχλος and in the ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας the Lord Himself feels and indicates the historical as well as the typical-prophetical significance of this moment, of this glorification of the Father in the Son through the coming forth of the dead at the voice of the Son of God. Understand —εἶπον, Therefore was I constrained to say it, and that Thou knowest! Ebrard's well-meaning remark, "herein lay at the same time a request that the Father would impress the event upon the hearts of the people, and draw them to Him," is not in itself to be quarrelled with; but we would prefer to omit such a reflection from the sublime εὐχαριστῶ σοι, in which He, conscious of His own glory from the Father and in the Father's sight, rather expects than prays for the subsequent faith of all who were susceptible of faith, and, as it were, gives *thanks* for them already by anticipation.[1] And this is He, who Himself after a few days goes to His own death, Whom they decree to kill because He raised from the dead!

Vers. 43, 44. In regard to what has His Father heard Him? That He would cause that this dead man should be dead no longer, but live again and arise? and that now before our eyes? Yea, verily, then will we believe! But how will, how can such a thing be? The Lord, unexpectedly even to the thus matured

[1] "Thus He thinks not of His own honour, only of the people's believing, by which they would be saved." So Braune with a good meaning, if rightly understood; but the salvation of those who believe reflects back again, on the other hand, His own glory.

Hosted by Google

expectation of the people, *at once* utters the awakening word in its simplest expression. And *with a loud voice:* assuredly, for the people's sake again, that every one may hear; as well as on account of the dignity of the moment, in its typical significance as a prelude of the final voice at the last day. Then was that brought to their eyes and ears, of which the church afterwards sang: Tuba mirum spargens sonum, per sepulchra regionum, coget omnes ante thronum—mors stupebit et natura, cum resurget creatura, Judicanti responsura. *Κραυγάζω* is more than *κράζω* (ch. vii. 37)—it is used here only concerning Jesus; comp. Matt. xii. 19, *οὐδὲ κραυγάσει*: see the expression elsewhere, Matt. xv. 22; Jno. xviii. 40, xix. 6, 15; Acts xxii. 23. This loud call, at the same time, is in suggestive contrast with the magical whisperings and murmuring incantations of unholy traffickers with death—as the remark of Grotius intimates, non magico susurro. (Comp. Isa. xxix. 4, viii. 19, the צְפַצֵּף in connection with the לַחַשׁ). But how runs the loud word? Not, Thou dead one, live again! Nor, Arise! as elsewhere; but, instead of naming the *grave*, it is merely *ἔξω*, merely a gracious summoning *δεῦρο*. Just as it might be spoken to the living, *as if the dead were not dead.* Had he then been already revivified through the Father's answering might,[1] and was this call not properly the awakening call, and *this* not the moment and crisis of the miracle? By no means: for this would go counter to the unity of the Father and the Son; it would oppose the plain expression afterwards used—whom He *called* from the dead into life! Against this testifies the analogy of קוּמִי, Mark v. 41, *ἐγέρθητι* Lu. vii. 14, as well as the *ἀκούσαντες ζήσονται* Jno. v. 25, 28, to which we have already with Alford referred.[2] We think that the sophistical distinction, in connection with this sublime reality, is as ridiculous as the contest upon the twofold truth—Jesus rose again, and the Father raised Him from the dead. The Father had already given Him to perform this work, so that He can by anticipation give thanks; at the same time, never-

[1] Lampe: ex quo nostra hypothesis, qua credimus, Lazarum ante eucharistiam Domini vitam recepisse, non parum constabilitur.

[2] The immoderately paraphrastic Nonnus sets out quite correctly here with *λιποφθόγγοιο δὲ νεκροῦ ἄπνοον ἐψύχωσε δέμας νεκυσσος ἠχώ.*

Hosted by Google

theless, the Father giveth it to Him now first at this moment to perform it through and in the Father's power.

He that was dead comes forth *immediately:* not, as is usual in waking from deep sleep, gradually aroused, stirring himself, reflecting, and setting himself free. He who thus depicts the scene to himself, misses its sublime truth. It was *the dead man*, as he had been before death, sound as before his sickness; Lazarus himself, given back once more to earthly life; for indeed —"Christ could (and would) restore men as they had been; because they must be again what they had been in mind and function; not glorified men after the fashion of Moses and Elias, for such would not have been for an earthly life." (Kleuker.) An old legend preserved in Epiphanius (Hæres. 66, 34) informs us that Lazarus was then thirty years old, and lived afterwards other thirty years, and this might seem to harmonise with internal propriety. We cannot positively decide, in relation to Lazarus, that the souls of those who were raised by Jesus had never passed into the final actuality of death, into the full consciousness of another state. Though they, "according to the plain description of all the Evangelists, awake as from a sleep," this does not decide that "Lazarus had nothing to tell of another life." This last we fully believe, because the lifting of the great veil by means of individual persons would have been opposed to the whole profoundly planned economy of God; because the design of these resurrections was only to manifest the glory of God, and not to gratify an improper curiosity as to the concealed Hereafter. But to that end the remembrances of the returning man might be blotted out; though we cannot unconditionally deny that Lazarus *might* have *related* in deep secrecy something to his sister Mary or to an Apostle. In all these mysteries we are bound to silence, even as the Scripture is silent.[1]

Lazarus *walked*, when he was under the mighty enforcement

[1] This, in allusion to Ebrard (S. 401), who too boldly maintains that "all the dead who were raised by our Lord, although their souls were separated, and their bodies beginning to undergo corruption, are manifestly *distinguished* by this declarative κοιμᾶσθαι as still capable of being awakened, as not having come under *all* the relations and consequences of death." For does not the Apostle speak in precisely the same terms of the dead at the last day?

Hosted by Google

of the call of Jesus to come forth; that is, he moved as well as he was able: he could not at once walk perfectly, not, however, through want of strength, but because the *κειρίαι* hindered him, and the napkin upon his face prevented his seeing. Thus much we gather from the simple narrative. We are not sure what was the custom among the Jews of that day, in the *περιστέλλειν τὸ σῶμα* (Ecclus. xxxviii. 16); and the *τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας* of the text does not decide whether, as in the case of the Egyptian mummies,[1] each foot and each hand, and each finger was wound round. We cannot therefore assert anything positively on the question of the motion of the bound man. The simplicity of faith once thought that there was here (according to the expression of Basil) a *θαῦμα ἐν θαύματι*, a moving where moving would have been otherwise impossible; nor is there any sure ground upon which this may be contradicted, and the controversy upon it is as needless as in the case of the *ἤδη ὄζει* before. For our own part, as we were there inclined to think that St John declares through Martha a fact, so we here think that the *δεδεμένος*, almost parallel as it is with *τεθνηκώς*, and strikingly contrasted with the *ἐξῆλθεν*, indicates something wonderful, and according to appearance impossible. One who was *δεδεμένος τοὺς πόδας*, taking the expression in its simple meaning, could not ordinarily move; and we have no sure ground for lowering its meaning, any more than we have for understanding the *ὄψις* of the forehead merely (though the word is certainly so used, see Jer. iii. 3, Sept. for מֵצַח).[2] Some prefer to think that the enveloping was but loose, as the embalming was to come afterwards, and that in moving it became still looser; against this we offer no argument, but *to us* the word of the Evangelist and of Jesus seems to intimate another meaning. For the rest, the restraint and wrapping in which the dead man first comes forth, contains an allegory capable of discreet application to spiritual quickening. The relics of the grave which still hang around our limbs and face are to be removed by the Lord's appointment through the further ministries of men.

Not without awe and dismay to the beholders did this coming forth take place. The first aspect of the corpse returning to life

[1] Whose custom the Jews followed, according to Tacitus. Hist. v. 5.

[2] See Klee's intelligent note upon this.

Hosted by Google

was spared to them through the human provision of concealment; but sufficiently fearful was the appearing of the enfolded form, the sudden conjunction of all the apparatus of death with the realities of life.[1] But we must not overrate this, as Teschendorff does, who makes even the sisters fall at the feet of Jesus, crying, "Lord, Thou dost astound us to death!" who speaks of the blank horror of all hearts (of Mary's, John's, and Nathanael's?), indeed represents the hollow voice of the dead man interposed, "Who has called me forth? Wherefore left ye me not in my slumber? And art Thou here, O Master! I long tarried for Thee. Joy to me that Thou art here!" Such human additions serve only to make more impressive the simple silence of the sacred narrative. Pfenninger better represents the diversified influence of the scene upon the general multitude: "A hundred voices broke forth in cries of amazement; a hundred hands were stretched forth to the everlasting heavens; hundreds sank down upon their knees; hundreds smote upon their breasts; hundreds stood as if petrified—among these last the sisters themselves."

The Lord alone was serene and collected, as if nothing unusual had occurred:—this is testified by His final word, in contrast with the silently intimated excitement of all the rest. It is no appearance, but the living Lazarus—venture therefore to approach him and *set him free!* Not only does he live, but in all his vigour and soundness—hold him, therefore, and lead him no further—*Let him go!*[2] As He before caused the stone to be removed, so now human hands are to do the rest; He Himself at first lays not His hand upon His friend. Without His commandment, pointing to their most natural and obvious duty, no one would have dared at once to approach the moving man. By the *loosing*, the restoration to life was completed and confirmed, as by the food given in the case of the maid; and "Lazarus was now brought to contemplate himself." He was to ὑπάγειν, that is, to go to his house, where he would have time and place to utter his thanksgiving and show his love. The multitude should not then dis-

[1] No human eye, at His resurrection, beheld Jesus in His *apparatus of death!*

[2] Lange: "Hold him no longer, as if he needed support. Nothing more is wanting but to release him from the external bonds of death; the internal are broken already."

Hosted by Google

quiet him by looking and touching; they were not even to go with him, but ἄφετε ὑπάγειν. This applied to all who had come around Mary and Martha, to the ὄχλος περιεστώς; and the first word λύσατε was indefinitely spoken as an appeal and command to the multitude (αὐτοῖς). Who executed it, what further was spoken or done in the house, whether the Lord Himself went with them immediately or first spoke to the people, or whether (as is most probable) He *at once* retired and concealed Himself, as ver. 54 seems to intimate afterwards—the narrative informs us not. The Evangelist has recorded the great event; and now hastens, with sublime brevity, to the general consequences of this miracle.

The τινὲς δέ, ver. 46, are certainly *not* believers, as they were to whom they are opposed;[1] and now Lu. xvi. 31 is strikingly fulfilled. The glory of God is before their eyes, but is not seen. *The things which Jesus had done* are not maliciously denounced to them, but reported indifferently; and in the high council held thereupon, their "deliberations begin in the most unadvised manner." The Son of God remains to them οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος! The πολλὰ σημεῖα do not divert them from the idea that *they* must do something in order to prevent His being thus left alone, as if this lay with them. They feared that all men were believing on Him, that is, would accept Him as King and Messiah, so that then *their* dominion would come to an end. *This* is their especial fear and prompter; but in their hypocritical sanctity they seem to impose in some degree upon themselves, and, devising a pretext as such evil ones holding counsel together with some remnant of shame are wont to do, they speak of the Romans. That τόπος (according to 2 Macc. v. 19, comp. Acts vi. 14) signifies, first of all, the temple, and at most the holy city in

[1] Some have very inappropriately interpreted the ἐξ αὐτῶν, which certainly is used with reference to the previous ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, as if it signified some *of those who believed!* (So Braune, who points to the dependence of these believers upon the authorities.) The δέ intimates a contrast; and Alford very properly observes, that this Evangelist, who is very consistent in his use of particles, carries onward the manifestation of the glory of Christ by οὖν, whereas δὲ generally prefaces the development of the antagonist manifestation of hatred and rejection.

Hosted by Google

addition, must be held fast as phraseologically correct, in spite of Luthardt's contradiction;[1] while undoubtedly the expression passes over afterwards into a similar common phrase, such as Luther translates, "Land und Leute," land and people. (Nonnus: ἔθνος ὁμοῦ καὶ χῶρον.) The Romans, indeed, had the land already; but they had hitherto spared the rights of the sanctuary, and the freedom of the *people* (ἔθνος differently from λαός afterwards).[2] All this these hypocrites regard as endangered, if this Messiah, who is no Messiah, this wonderworker, who yet will not contend and save Himself, should proceed a little longer on His course. We may spare ourselves the trouble to disentangle the foolish confusion of these thoughts; Caiaphas pronounces the true judgment upon them—ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε οὐδέν. But what better, then, does he know? Cunningly enough relieving the scruples of many; and yet with a proud dictatorial tone, as if commanding the reasons of all, he helps the assembly to the issue of all their thoughts. Are we to have done with this one man? To speak plainly what we have all long wished—*Let him die!* (He, who has just raised from the dead, or whatever else was the truth in this new σημεῖον.) That is the better, instead of a destruction of the whole people. And if he is no more than an innocent enthusiast, who commits nothing worthy of death, let him be a political sacrifice, ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ.[3]

In *this* word even the mouth of Caiaphas is constrained to prophesy. Although in spirit he is no other than *one of them*, he is yet by office the *high priest* of this great year, in which, on the true day of atonement, the typical priesthood and sacrifices ended;[4] the last of those high priests, many of whom irregularly ruled only for single years. That a *popular sentiment* at that time ascribed to the office the gift of any, even unconscious pro-

[1] Who too critically supposes that the αἴρειν, to take away, wrest from, is only applicable to the territory, and not to the temple.

[2] Neander paraphrases correctly: the Romans will make this an occasion to take away from us all *that they have left.*

[3] We doubt much whether, as Münchmeyer says, λαός and ἔθνος are used promiscuously in Scripture.

[4] Compare Luthardt's excellent exposition, i. 87 ff. Alford does not admit this significance in the expression, but understands the words to refer to some official distinction from Annas (the high priest de jure), the exact nature of which is lost to us. But this has force rather in ch. xviii. 13.

Hosted by Google

phecy, cannot be proved, and is rather improbable; for Philo's subtilties do not represent the people's faith. The Urim and Thummim cannot be appealed to here, since (as Lange says) it was only the decisive vote of the high priest in theocratic questions generally which was thereby signified, and not any distinctive expressions or oracles; and, further, they had been long extinct in practice. There is here no "relic of Old Testament faith in Urim and Thummim" (De Wette), but something very different. St John explains to us that Caiaphas here prophesied, and that as high priest; and this has its justification and warrant in the dealings of God from all antiquity,[1] and especially in the history of His Son upon earth. As Pilate, the representative of this world's power, was constrained to *bear witness*, in the superscription upon the cross, of the *King;* so must we regard it as a grand *irony of a most special Providence at this crisis*, that the retiring high priesthood should unconsciously and involuntarily by its last representative speak of the true *sin-offering*. Thus St John rightly discerns in these words of political expediency, a *ὑπόνοια* imposed upon them by the Spirit; yet he himself extends and corrects the limitation of *ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ* (for which he sets the explanatory *ἐθνους*), and carries us back to the Lord's own word, ch. x. 15, 16.

The decree of death is decided. Jesus knew that His consummation was appointed at the paschal feast, neither after nor before; He therefore withdraws after the manifestation of His glory; and, further, the concourse and tumult of those who had become believers compels Him to depart. For this faith was, certainly, as Braune strikingly says, on the part of many "simply a faith in which the understanding did not say no, but the heart did not yet say yes." We know not with certainty, even after Lange's disquisition, where Ephraim or Ephrem was situated. But by the report of the excited suspense of the people —*ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν*;—the Evangelist prepares the way for all that follows, the secret and undisturbed anointing at Bethany, the public tumultuous entry into Jerusalem, the last catastrophe.

[1] De Wette groundlessly maintains that prophesying with a double meaning is altogether foreign to the Old Testament. (Stud. u. Krit. 1834. 4. 937.)

Hosted by Google

THE ANOINTING AT BETHANY.

(John xii. 7, 8; Matt. xxvi. 10–13; Mark xiv. 6–9.)

We cannot harmoniously arrange this exposition of the Lord's discourses otherwise than by giving undividedly the whole of what St John so characteristically records down to the end of ch. xvii.; although the sixth part of the work must commence anew with the Synoptics concerning the preparation of the paschal lamb, and then join with St John in the details of the imprisonment and the remainder. We therefore renounce the special harmonistic adjustment of the last discourses in St John; much difficulty attends it, the solution of which subserves but little our understanding of them. In this distribution, which leaves each Evangelist as much as possible in his own propriety, we have already closed with Matt. xxv., Mar. xiii., and Lu. xxi.; *now* we encounter *in St John* the anointing, which St Matthew and St Mark record in another place; and we shall of course introduce them as parallels.

From Ephraim (if we reconcile them all) the final way of our Lord is to Jerusalem through Jericho, where He heals the blind men, and enters the house of Zacchæus; His sojourn in *Bethany*, before He provides the ass and rides upon it, is to be inserted at Luke xix. 28. Not that this plainly coincides with every expression of the synoptical narrative, for each Evangelist simply records what the Spirit makes prominent to himself *for his own plan*, unconcerned about the day and the hour, and such other petty circumstantials as so much embarrass our modern historical criticism; but, on that very account, we also unconcernedly regard as perfect truth in essentials everything which each Evangelist records. St John, always precise in his chronology, where he gives it, assures us that the anointing in Bethany took place *six days before the Passover;* consequently the old supposition must be true, that St Matthew and St Mark insert the same incident *retrospectively*, in order to indicate the occa-

Hosted by Google

sion of Judas' betrayal and thence of the Lord's imprisonment at the feast at the same time suggestively—to place this "anticipation of the burial" at the commencement of the history of the passion. Our readers will take it for granted that we are fully acquainted with all the subtleties of controversy which has raged around these circumstantials; but they will be well content with our well-weighed opinion merely, as we hasten on to greater matters. We think it most probable that Jesus came to Bethany on the Friday evening, at the commencement of the Sabbath, that He might spend one calm Sabbath there before the entry into Jerusalem; the meal will then be rightly placed on the Saturday, on the Sabbath itself.[1]

He had obviously not been there again since the resurrection of Lazarus; it is highly improbable that any express *invitation* had induced Him to come, for their profound reverence would permit them only to wait for Him. But when He had come, and that on the Sabbath, their thankful devotion ventures something more: *they* provide Him a festal repast—that is, the faithful disciples of Bethany (Lampe: quod numerus pluralis suadere videtur). And it is quite in harmony, that according to St Matthew and St Mark, this δεῖπνον was in the house of one "Simon the leper;" obviously, as Chrysostom remarked, one healed of his leprosy,[2] and is it not obvious again, healed *by* Jesus Himself?[3] As a thankful memorial he retains the name of his former humiliation and sorrow, that is, among the disciples; just as Lazarus is called here, ὁ τεθνηκὼς, ὃν ἤγειρεν. The former expression must not be lightly given up, with Teschendorff: it evidently belongs to the full-toned description. Among the living and eating was *the dead* and *risen again*: the Evangelist does not so speak for the sake of a petty confirmation

[1] Luthardt places it on the Sunday, which does not appear established by his data, nor consistent with the Sunday-entry. Neander holds it the last and best solution of the difficulty, to fix Christ's coming to Jericho on the Friday.

[2] For it is a most marvellous supposition, devised by some, that this was a *family name*, after the manner of the Romans in their Claudii, Cæci, Balbi, etc.!

[3] An old legend makes him the father of Lazarus; and some glosses are to be found which convert him into the husband of Martha!

Hosted by Google

of the miracle, but to depict the scene in all its significance, as we find still more evidently in ver. 2—εἷς τῶν ἀνακειμένων evidently indicates, at the same time, that he in this house was a guest with other guests. Silent, and solemn, and self-involved we may suppose this dead man restored to life for a long time afterwards; certainly so now in the presence of Him who raised him: between the raised Lazarus and the healed leper the Lord probably sits as between two trophies of His glory. It needs no explanation that Martha finds means to serve, even in a strange house, where she might serve *Him;* but Mary (whom St Matthew and St Mark mysteriously call only "a woman") shows herself in all her greatness, in the still, internal glow of her love to Jesus. She honours and anoints Him, as her heart prompts, with all the magnificence and costly tribute which is in her power. St Matthew and St Mark term the vessel ἀλάβαστρον, as we find also in Luke vii. 37: and this might be (according to Pollux) a term for any vessel containing unguent, or μυρηρὸν, as Theocritus Idyll. xv. 114, *signs* of *golden* alabaster boxes of Syrian ointment. The costliness of the μύρον (a general name for all sweetly-smelling fluids) is made prominent by each of the three Evangelists: for the same reason St John gives the weight. It was *nard*, celebrated in all antiquity, and also in the Old Testament (where נֵרְדְּ, however, occurs only in the Canticles) among odoriferous ointments; but as to the πιστική[1] (which, however, is a specific term, since two of the Evangelists agree in its use), we may say in the blunt language of the Berlenb. Bible: "we leave others to trouble themselves about it, who love to meddle with such matters; and who are

[1] Nonnus retains πιστικός, but scans the middle syllable long. Vulg., in St Mark, has nardi spicati (but in St John pistici), hence many have assumed a transposition for this Latin word (Kistemaker: of ears of nard). Others interpret it, drinkable or liquid; and Fritsche prefers this. But most probably it is, according to the later Greek usage (in Aristotle), quod fidei est exploratæ—thus *genuine*, Indian, not Pseudonardus, as Pliny says (Theophyl. ἄδολος, Euthym. ἄκρατος). The Syr. רִישׁוֹיָא points that way. Others have derived it from the name of a place—but without grounds. And what more is wanting? The word in its precision serves to assure us of the historical truth of the occurrence. Sepp (iii. 175, note), following Friedlieb's Archäologie der Leidensgeschichte, has treated the question very learnedly.

Hosted by Google

wont to weary the brains of the people about them, instead of setting them forward on their great pilgrimage, showing off at the same time their learning and great reading."

Breaking the vessel (probably only above the neck, hence the Syr. in St Mark has וּפַתְחַתְּהּ,—and opened it; but probably also for the sake of pouring all forth more quickly) she anoints not the Lord's head merely, but in the superabounding fulness of her love and humility, as St John significantly supplements, His feet also, which she wipes with the tresses of her hair. All sprang from the deep, unhesitating impulse of love, the symbolical expression of mighty emotion. St John remembers that the house was full of the odour; and mentions this not without allusion to Cant. i. 12. "As if her soul would pour itself forth as a sacrifice of sacred love and faith,"[1] but, alas! not all hearts are full of the sweet odour, or enter into the spirit and meaning of her beautiful act. Even in the circle of the Apostles there is murmuring blame; for this scent is odious to the nostrils of the traitor Judas. It is a false view to regard him as only sharing the sentiments of all. (Dräseke, "and he murmuring concealed himself behind the others.") That he, on the other hand, was the *originator*, St Matthew and St Mark do not indeed expressly say; but they plainly hint as much in the connection (not otherwise discernible) of this with his immediate departure to the high priests. He may have begun gently, and the other disciples, "whose love was not yet much acquainted with the external developments of love" (Niemeyer), suffer themselves too easily to be led into concurrence. For "censure infects like a plague" (Berlen. Bib.). Could we but know the wicked origin of many of the judgments which we thoughtlessly echo, the Judas-heart from which springs many of the current criticisms of books and of things—how should we recoil from them! Made bolder, at length, Judas speaks out aloud his censure; not, however, "blustering and vehement" (as Teschendorff thinks), but,

[1] So in Pape's poem, Christus. S. 118. Horch's mystical and prophetical Bible speaks, however, in another style: "The broken vase with the precious unguent represented the breaking of His body, after which His name was to be as ointment poured forth, through the preaching of the Gospel, etc., according to Cant. i. 3. Might not the Lord's words, Matt. xxvi. 13, have such a thought in the background?"

Hosted by Google

rather, in the most measured style. The act was an *ἀπώλεια*, a useless, yea, sinful waste![1] What a contrast with this Judas is the affectionate heart of Mary! What a contrast, generally, between woman's spirit and that of the men of Israel, His enemies! How could he who had no heart for the love of Jesus, apprehend that of Mary? *To him* it has been long insufferable that Jesus should be honoured by many in such immoderate ways; to him, "who would rather have money in his purse than the Saviour in his heart." And now so precious an ointment is spent upon the very feet of the Master! That Mary should go to such an expense, he might have put to the account of appearance and excess of display; he reckons it up quickly in his mind —Three hundred pence are wasted here—indeed more than that (according to St Mark).

But he is aware of one very specious *objection;* for the Lord had often enough exhorted them to take care of the poor, while He had never, on the other hand, desired for Himself *such* distinctions. The comment would admit of a very *rational* exposition and justification:—How inconsiderate is the act of this Mary—how many poor in Bethany and elsewhere might have been solaced with such a sum as this, whereas now Jesus and we all derive from it nothing but a transitory scent, etc. *Εἰς τί*—of what use to him or to any is this waste? It is worth so much, and yet too little for such a purpose—*why* was it not more profitably applied in the right direction? Had this "pious enthusiast" but thought better of it, sold the ointment, and given the money *to the poor!* We doubt whether Judas meant—to *us* poor Apostles; but St John's explanatory remark[2] seems to intimate his meaning to have been that she should have given it to that end into *his* keeping, to be put into the common chest;

[1] Bengel hesitates not to cry out—Imo tu, Juda, *perditionis* es.

[2] Which well agrees with the notice of St Luke viii. 3; and shows besides that out of the poor bag of Jesus alms were sometimes given to the poor. That *ἐβάσταζε* signifies *auferre* or defrauding (Nonnus: *ἀναιρτάζειν*, Theophyl.: *κλέπτειν*) we do not believe, in common with many others, Braune, for example; for the phrase does not admit such a meaning, and such a meaning does not suit the *τὰ βαλλόμενα*. We have no sympathy with the style of treating Scripture which allows Neander to think that this was a human error of the Evangelist, who was misled to discern ex eventu earlier signs of Judas' covetousness in this transaction.

Hosted by Google

that so he might by degrees expend it in alms and defray their common charges. The γλωσσόκομον was then probably empty, since Jesus was far removed from Galilee; but after all this hypocritical lamentation over the money stands in close connection with the traitorous and thievish lust which afterwards moved him.[1]

We shall not spend time upon the question, how St John came to know that Judas was a thief:—that may have made itself plain in some way afterwards; or let every one explain it as he may. But we shall enter carefully, in order to understand and apply the far-reaching word of Jesus in all its significance, into the general scope of the blame which was expressed, as it bore a typical character. And that, not simply because the original principle in Judas was so evil, and its semblance of good such rank hypocrisy, but because the other disciples could with no guilty intention so easily concur in it. We have here an example of all those views and of all those judgments which have their foundation in the favourite *principle of utilitarianism*, and which may too often be applied falsely,—to the wounding of pious hearts, and to the damage of that justifiable *cultus* in the Church of God which aims worthily to express the sentiments of reverence and love, or which in itself is productive of highest blessing. This lays bare the root of many evils in our own day, from the parsimonious dealing of statesmen and boards for ecclesiastical objects, and the suspicion with which missionary offerings for the extension of the kingdom of Christ are looked at "because of the poor whom we have at home," down to the slightest exhibitions of this feeling, calculating by the pettiest and most inapplicable rules. We have here, further and more generally, an example of all "cold judgments passed upon the virtuous emotions of warm hearts"[2]—of all more or less con-

[1] "Benevolence covered theft; the mask of good works inward hypocrisy. This is the consummate picture of hypocritical display in conjunction with dead works." (Harless.)

[2] See Schlosser's Essay with this title in Pfenninger's Sammlungen zu einem christol. Magazin, 2 Band, 2 Heft, S. 63, and which exhibits the "displeasure" of the disciples as not entering into the spirit and sentiment of Mary's heart!—But we very much doubt whether, according to Rothe (Ethik iii. 823), our Lord here in a general sense vindicates a lawful *luxury;* or whether, according to Schleiermacher (Homil. über Johan.), He here

Hosted by Google

scious or unconscious censures of the artless outgoings and acts of honest feeling—of all narrow-hearted criticism of others according to our own mind and temper—and, finally, of that slavish spirit which would mete out all good works in the service of God and our neighbour by rigid rule, and against which we should cry with all our hearts, "Pardon us, Lord, our *methodical* goodness and our *methodical* devotion!" Against all these, and everything like them, the words of our Lord Jesus most decisively protest; words in which He condemns those who condemned, consoles and dignifies His servant Mary, reveals even the prophetic spirit as suggesting to her this action, places everything in its own propriety, and thus, finally, resolves the discord which had arisen in their thoughts into the most lovely and noble harmony—for all except Judas.

There are, properly speaking, *four* words, the *succession* of which St Matthew, as always in our view, most accurately preserves, St Mark agreeing with him. The justification of the wounded Mary naturally comes first. With this is connected the acknowledgment of what was right in their care for the poor, for the sake of giving the other disciples their due; yet even in this there is a transition from these poor, always with them, to *Himself* who was about to leave them. *Then* follows the explanation—She hath anointed Me to the burial! Finally, and this could have been nowhere but at the close, the promise of a memorial throughout the world. St John, following his design, or according to his own sentiment and remembrance, places the ἐνταφιασμός first, as the true καλὸν ἔργον; he omits (in fulfilling it himself) the final promise, in order that he may *close* with the sorrowful words, which prepare the way for the Lord's departure —Me ye have not always!

St Matthew and St Mark *hint* that Judas commenced this crimination; and St John further hints that the other disciples concurred with him, though without malicious intention: the sing. ἄφες in our Evangelist is directed to Judas, the ἔχετε to

admits the propriety of gratifying the pure tendencies of our humanity by applying our earthly goods to the amenities of social life. Mary's view was something quite different from this; her beautiful act was not a tribute to social feeling, but an act performed on Jesus in worship, from holy and profound emotion.

Hosted by Google

all the rest. Thus the first word was one which stilled their murmur, reflecting back their blame upon themselves,—ἄφες or ἄφετε (the latter according to St Mark, as in the Vulg. *Sinite* though not in all the Codd.); and it simply said—Cease these thoughts and these words, they please *Me* not! In this single expression He utters His calm and dignified decision, admitting no appeal; but, as He is speaking in the circle of His disciples and friends, He proceeds to give the reason of His judgment. Instead of this St Matthew and St Mark have an additional and yet stronger protest against them. Why trouble ye, distress, and afflict—κόπους παρέχετε τῇ γυναικί or αὐτῇ? He does not say —*Me*, although He might, humanly speaking, have felt Himself aggrieved by their estimate, that such honour and anointing was too great, too precious for Him! But He is wounded in the wounding of Mary, troubled in her trouble; and this He utters therefore all the more emphatically, making her cause His own.[1] Thus this calm joy of love is embittered to Him; for in this perverse generation some drop of suffering must be infused into all His consolations. (Pfenninger: "Joyful as was this Sabbath meal, it ended not without trouble and disquietude.") How profoundly and affectionately does He sympathise with what Mary must have felt, who finds herself so unexpectedly misunderstood! "The delusion, that all must love what we love (and *as* we love) is so natural"—but now she is undeceived by a cold word of the Apostles, spoken in the midst of the warm impulse of her love. Albertini preaches incorrectly—"There dwelt in her secret heart a blessedness which could not be affected by any external circumstances; and she expected nothing other than the blame of the disciples. Nevertheless, when this was expressed so warmly, a slight cloud may have shaded the heaven of her soul." Oh no! How could she have *expected* blame from the *disciples?* and when this was expressed not *warmly*, indeed, but with the semblance of truth and reason, this κόπους παρέχετε was more than a passing cloud. She may have thought, "the disciples are right, I have acted inconsiderately, it will not please Him." On that account it is that the Lord surpasses their blame by His own instant praise and consolation;—not merely

[1] Yet, again, without mentioning Mary, or giving her any endearing name! That would have been derogatory to His dignity.

Hosted by Google

has she done nothing wrong, but a beautiful and noble deed. This *καλόν* is more, indeed, than *ἀγαθόν*; and the translation should hit the precise force of this expression. Affectionate devotion at the right time, the thoughtful, corresponsive expression of the deepest feeling—is not that lovely? Not merely does Mary perform a *work* in this anointing, as much as her sister's in her serving;[1] but her work is the more noble, if we understand and estimate it in its spirit and meaning. Behold here the moral *æsthetics*, as it were, in the estimation of human acts, which the Lord teaches and requires. Elsewhere He commends faith or love; here, because it is assailed, He commends the *deed;* but derives its profound value from the state of the soul, which is expressed by external act. He corrects, by His lofty decision, the manifold errors of human judgment as to what is good, and what is noble, in human works. It is not necessary that they be great, and widely influential acts, for the result gives them not their value, but the intention; still less are we to apply everywhere the standard of common benevolence or usefulness, for an apparent waste may be deserving of commendation. Finally, He does not omit to add, as the deepest ground of His supreme verdict—She hath done it *unto Me!* (Matt. *εἰς ἐμέ*, Mark *ἐν ἐμοί*.) Not so much to complain —Is that then of no importance? Am I not worthy of this honour? as to teach generally by this specific instance *what* is the first, and most essential regulating measure of all good and lovely works. "The *first* command is, To love God above all; and *then*, our neighbour as ourselves."[2] Of what value is all our vaunted love of our neighbour and of the poor, without the love of God therein?[3] But He places Himself involuntarily and naturally in the stead of God, even in the midst of His self-renouncing, sympathising humility: for He could do no otherwise. Humbly self-renouncing, as a Friend in the

[1] The *εἰργάσατο* with *ἔργον* is more emphatic than a mere *ἐποίησεν*.

[2] So Lössel on the passage, in his Wort und Leben, Betrachtungen nach dem Ev. Matth. S. 503.

[3] "Not, as men are wont to say, for *God's* sake!" So Diesterweg. Harless, on the other hand: "Judas, the hypocrite and traitor, was the first preacher of that doctrine of the exclusive value of so-called good works, in the New Testament."

Hosted by Google

circle of friends, He began; majestically, judicially self-asserting must He continue and end. Both are suddenly combined in one brief sentence—and this is the authentic style of the words of Jesus! Done unto *Him*, not done unto *Him*—this will finally arbitrate upon all the works of men. Be confident, therefore, misunderstood soul: He knoweth thee and thy purpose. And even if His disciples blame thee, He will justify thee both now and hereafter.

The poor, of whom ye other disciples speak with good intention and partial truth (all three have the article)—are never wanting to you. It is probable that the Lord, recalling a passage of Scripture, said *only* this, and that the addition of St Mark is an explanatory reflection; yet this deduction seems very appropriate in the connection. Ὅταν θέλητε would then contain, at the same time, a gentle ironical intimation of the absence of earnest intention on the part of Judas; while the αὐτοὺς εὖ ποιῆσαι would be the corresponding counterpart to the καλὸν ἔργον ἐν ἐμοί. The passage alluded to is Deut. xv. 11, which must be taken with ver. 4 of the same chapter. In connection with the remission of debts in the year of jubilee it was said, אֶפֶס כִּי לֹא יִהְיֶה בְּךָ אֶבְיוֹן—where the אֶפֶס כִּי may be understood variously.[1] Not, *to the end* that no poor may be among you. Rather, with Michaelis: *unless* there be no poor needing remission—yet he is opposed, as Meyer well remarks, by ver. 11 afterwards. Since elsewhere (*e.g.* Num. xiii. 28; Amos ix. 8; Judg. iv. 9, see Nold. Conc. part. who adds our passage with hesitation) אֶפֶס כִּי is *tamen*, *veruntamen*, a promise has been found here as a ground of encouragement for the remission:—Ye shall do yourselves no injury thereby, in making yourselves poor; for the Lord will bless you in your obedience to His commandments. But this is forced, and the אֶבְיוֹן is still the same, in whose favour the remission is to be made. Consequently, the only right meaning is (that to which Aben-Ezra's expression, misunderstood by Rosenmüller, pointed)—*Nevertheless* or *in truth* there would be no poor among you, if ye obeyed My com-

[1] But not, with Luther, that it is not a conjunction at all. He makes an inappropriate distinction between the "beggar," ver. 4, and the "poor," ver. 11, and thus makes a Bible-sentence very often used by the uninformed.

Hosted by Google

mandments, etc.[1] With this is placed in significant contrast the subsequent prediction of ver. 11, לֹא יֶחְדַּל אֶבְיוֹן מִקֶּרֶב הָאָרֶץ— the poor will not be wanting, they will not cease; instead of which the Lord says, *πάντοτε ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν*, in order to prepare for the antithesis—but *Me* ye have not always. Thus, that there always are poor rests, according to the whole internal connection of that chapter of Moses, which is at once the solution of the fact and true in history, upon the *sin* of Israel, which yet by full obedience might be capable of blessing. The Lord now confirms the same in His word *to the disciples* (which like every such word is designed also for the future of *His* people) with regard to the Christian commonwealth. Diesterweg in his book "Der Lebensfrage der Civilisation," maintains boldly that "it was not the eternal Creator who established or produced the present system of social life," and he is so far right as our sin is certainly the original cause, as of every evil, so also of our pauperism. But when he altogether denies the Divine dispensation of poverty as the punishment of unrighteousness, and lays all its blame upon the not giving of those who have the means, he is entangled in that great error of a civilised age concerning this question of life which has only made the matter worse with *its* help. In effect, no reiterated *lex* agraria can abolish the poverty which is ever being reproduced, no St Simon or Bettina can stop this fountain; we must, indeed, *give* with the wisdom of charity, but without hoping that that will make poverty cease. The Lord's *πάντοτε* approves its truth to our own day, on account of sin, indeed, but also as a consequent counsel and will of God; Christian people must humbly adapt their views to this fact, and thoughtfully consider that the giving of alms is not the only *benevolence* to the poor. And to this the *εὖ ποιῆσαι* of St Mark might point! Show to the poor by thy own shining example, how He is loved and honoured — this is here the one thing which is needful to needy man.

[1] See Baumgarten's Commentary, who compares for אֶפֶס, Numb. xxii. 35, and beautifully deduces that Israel was to see in every poor man a testimony of the (already presupposed by the law) disobedience of the people; and consequently should *on that account* help his brother. Compare Jarchi, who simply unites vers. 4 and 11—If in one case ye do, and in the other, do not, God's will.

Hosted by Google

The Lord has thus admitted all that was right in the thoughts of the disciples who were misled by Judas; for the traitor and thief himself He has nothing more to say, although He looks through his soul at this moment of murmuring hypocrisy. He does not rebuke them in common—Ye have spoken a false and evil word concerning her noble act; for that would be too hard for those who were led astray with a good intention. He does not detect and expose the wicked spirit of their misleader—for "He is not just now disposed to inflict severe condemnation."[1] *Sorrowfully*—as He thinks of those fittest Scripture words which speak of the sad continuance of the poor, with all its profound meaning for all times—sorrowfully He leads them back to His own person, for which this was thought to be too much honour: But Me ye have *not always!* In a manner almost marvellous, He places Himself, to whom all actions of thanksgiving and love are due, in parallel with the poor on whom we bestow benefactions, and by Him, in His human tenderness, the separation from the earthly fellowship of His own is keenly felt. All that He had already foretold concerning His departure is brought to their remembrance by the gentle but emphatic οὐ πάντοτε—as if He should say, Have ye then forgotten that I shall be but a little while longer with you? But in the symbolical meaning of the whole, since *we* also may anoint Him like Mary, and thereby do better than by all our "confederations for elevating the working classes" without Him,—we may properly reflect in what sense we also have Him *not always* so near in His spiritual presence, and therefore that the right opportunities of presenting our offerings of thanks and love to Him are to be jealously seized. If the Lord spoke, in the former clause, for distant futurity, He may probably also have thought, in the latter, of that which we have now expressed.

We remarked above that the words which St John has placed first are to be regarded as spoken now:—She has, in truth, paid Me the "*last honour*," for death and the sepulchre are immediately before Me. At the moment of His kingly anointing, He speaks of dying; for thoughts of death now continually fill His soul, and images of physical death float before His eyes.

[1] Albertini in the sermon before quoted.

Hosted by Google

In the midst of this festal joy He sees His anointed body as an embalmed corpse in the sepulchre! Into what a depth in the human consciousness of Jesus does this inexpressibly touching utterance—which suppressed all discord in every heart but that of Judas—permit us to look! The ἐνταφιάσαι or ἐνταφιασμός is found in all the narratives—it includes the whole interment, to which the anointing also belongs. St Matthew expresses the essential ground-thought in the simplest and most intelligible form,—In that she hath poured it on My *body*, she did it for My burial. St Mark introduces a more specific feature in the προέλαβε—She hath come beforehand, or hath anticipated it; and the meaning of this, as reconciling all the accounts, can only be that she performed on the living body that which was not performed on the dead, being both needless and unpermitted. St John, although he reverses the order, appears to us here also to preserve the original expression used by our Lord in τετήρηκεν.[1] This word is obviously opposed to the ἐπράθη and ἐδόθη in which Judas' desire had been expressed:—She has done rightly not to sell the ointment (which she possessed), but to preserve it for use *on this day*. Whence and for what purpose Mary obtained this μύρον (whether for the interment of Lazarus and his delayed embalming, as mentioned above) is a question not alluded to here, and all suppositions are free; but we, for our own part, think a provision made for the embalming of her brother, whether before or after his death, altogether improbable. The other anointings of the evangelical history give us instances of ointment being kept for sundry purposes. The Lord goes not beyond the fact of her having it in possession, as the disciples thought desirable another application. And we may say, in some sense, with Rieger, "she must have reserved it under the guidance of a higher hand," for the Lord *establishes from the providential significance of her action its*

[1] Lachmann's reading ἵνα τηρήσῃ, approved by Luthardt (Vulg. ut servet, Nonn. ὄφρα φυλάξῃ), Lücke properly regards, notwithstanding its diplomatic pretension, as incorrect; for the Lord takes the present day proleptically as the ἡμέρα τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ (and according to St Mark's προέλαβεν). Alford, similarly: The rec. reading seems to be an adaptation to Mark xiv. 8, in order to escape from the difficulty of understanding how she *could keep for His burial* what she *poured out now*.

Hosted by Google

moral propriety also, the genuine acceptableness before God of the sentiment and its expression.

Mary, however, thinks of nothing more than paying the Lord a tribute of honour at this feast, she does not refer in her own thoughts to His entombment or embalming. Many are not contented with this, but ascribe to her, according to the letter of the Lord's words, which certainly point that way, an actual consciousness of the near approaching burial of Jesus. (So Stückelberger, *e.g.*, among preachers: but the view has always been attractive to many. Dräseke says, "as she could not avert His fate, she would at least consecrate Him to His sad destiny.") This would be an impressive contrast with the deep blindness of Judas upon the future of Jesus,[1] as exhibiting the keen insight of a loving soul, or, at least, the half-conscious presentiment which overcame her on such a day and at such a critical moment (as He sat, that is, by the side of Lazarus, for whom the anointing should have been; and is purposing to go to Jerusalem among His enemies):—"Alas, when Thou diest, none will anoint Thee; I will therefore do it beforehand." There is something so attractive in this, that we dare not unconditionally deny it; but to our mature consideration there appears in it also something which is out of harmony with the plain simplicity of the whole procedure. We, therefore, hold to the common view, which every one can understand, that the Lord simply ascribes His own thoughts to Mary, and now by a *prophetic word* elevates, interprets, and glorifies her καλὸν ἔργον of affectionate love into a *prophetic act*. And here we are at one with Luthardt: "Her action becomes, without her knowledge, a symbolical token of what was to befall Jesus." This corresponds with the unconscious significance of many other actions and words during these His last days. Mary like Caiaphas!) This was the most ancient notion, as witnessed in the Peshito, which adds in Matthew and Mark a אַיִךְ:—*as if* or *as it were* for My burial. And it would have to the disciples the impressive meaning,—Would ye blame her, *if*—I were laid in the sepulchre dead? Would this anointing be too costly if it were actually for My

[1] For by means of the greatest sinner among the disciples, him who least understood the counsel of God, must the fulfilment of that counsel be brought about.

Hosted by Google

ἐνταφιασμὸς? Now, then, I tell you (do ye yet not know it of yourselves?)—it is near enough, and her deed has the value, before God and before Me, of an anointing for My burial![1] (See in Grotius the striking amplification of this thought.)

St Mark, finally, gives us another beautiful and undoubtedly genuine word, though he places it before us transitional,—*She hath done what she could!* The ἔσχεν of this phrase certainly cannot admit of any petty application to her wealth; we cannot tolerate such an interpretation of the Lord's sentiment as, in Judas' reckoning spirit, would make Him say—In the case of one more needy than she, such an objection would be ungraciously applied, but she, over and above, *hath* the means! Oh no, even if she, like the poor widow at the Treasury, had applied her utmost all to this purpose, Jesus would have likewise dignified and commended her act. Nor must we translate with Bengel's translation (though not in the Gnomon): What she *had to do* she has done,—what was appointed to her and therefore obligatory. This is opposed to the grammatical meaning; but to take ἔχειν for having in one's power or being able, is sound and safe. Thus, as it has been almost always practically understood in the church, it is the most gracious and the highest praise which any one can receive from the Lord's supreme estimate of his acts—What she could do, she has actually done! Mary was made capable of this noble act by her strong internal love—therefore she restrained not its expression, kept back nothing. Humble thyself, reader and hearer, in the presence of this Word, and think how great a thing it is, and how seldom it happens, that the Lord can say *this* of any man! But understand, also, *from this*, wherefore He has ordained a memorial of this deed for all futurity.

She hath done what she could! She has, even down to our Lord's sepulchre, performed on Him the beautiful offices of thankful love! This shall be the *inscription* over her, her *memorial* in all the world,[2] inseparably bound up with that Gospel which tells of the death by which life comes to the world. The

[1] Augustin de Civit. I. 13 justifies, by Mary's commendation, the expressions of love and honour paid, generally, to the corporibus defunctorum: Nec ideo tamen contemnenda et abjicienda sunt, etc.

[2] Μνημόσυνον in the Sept. for זִכָּרוֹן and זֵכֶר, also in Esth. ix. 32 for בְּסֵפֶר.

Hosted by Google

more unexpected and unusual is this utterance of our Lord, the more unhesitatingly we receive it from the hands of the two first Evangelists. It is (as Niemeyer says in his Characteristik) "the *only* time that the Lord has mentioned its reputation as the reward of a noble work." We must not shrink from admitting this because all glory belongs to God alone; in the words of Jesus "such remembrance is recorded as a good thing which, in a certain case, appertains to recompense" (Palmer, Katechetik. S. 164). But we must more deeply consider, that just now, when the question was of the oblique censures of men, and the vain show of supposed good works was in contrast, Jesus confers such honour upon a deed of love which even the disciples misunderstood and the world would think nothing of. "While He well knew that even in Christendom such perverted views of merit and fame would arise, He took this occasion to prescribe what should be true fame and true worthiness, and to assign to those who deserve it an abiding remembrance—in order that here, *at this last cross-way on the way to His cross*, all His followers should discriminate and decide." (Lossel.) Although the act had the appearance, and it was so interpreted against Mary, as if she designed by this costly anointing to make herself prominent, yet Mary in reality thought of nothing so little as her *own* honour; it was under the irrepressible impulse of her emotion that her silent, diffident spirit overcame itself and thus come forward. She sought no more, as Hase beautifully says, than a gracious glance. Nevertheless, and on that very account, the Lord predicts and appoints that she should be praised from generation to generation upon earth. Who but Himself had the power to insure to any work of man, even if resounding throughout the whole earth in his own time, an imperishable remembrance in the stream of history? Behold, once more, here the majesty of His royal, judicial supremacy in the government of the world, expressed in this Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν!

Yet He does not say at once and without qualification εἰς ἔπαινον or εἰς δόξαν αὐτῆς;[1] but that which should be spoken as

[1] Although the good Sepp, with great simplicity, makes the Lord glance at the future of His Church and the *veneration of relics!* But εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῶν λαληθήσεται ὅ, ἐποίησαν—at this limit the "veneration" should restrain itself.

Hosted by Google

a memorial of her, He applies to our instruction as an example. Similarly, Mary's deed obtains this undying remembrance only through its connection with Him and His Gospel. By *ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ* (Mark, *εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον*) He already here testifies what He afterwards prophesies to His disciples, Matt. xxiv. 14. *This* Gospel: that is, the message of peace and blessedness which should spring forth from His *death*, the kernel and centre of which should be His dying. This *Gospel* is not so much doctrine as *history;* this history is great and significant in all its lesser circumstances, the selection of which, under God's disposal, should be the *κήρυγμα*:—all this lies in the simple word which was spoken to this intent. Vainly does Br. Bauer's frenzy rage against the Lord's counsel—"Alas, that one must speak of such things! would that they had fallen into the oblivion which is their meet lot!" In vain he imagines that he "shall say such keen and annihilating things as shall render needless any further mention of them." Many other mockers' and blasphemers' names have been blotted out and their memory forgotten—but that which Mary did in secret Bethany has been spoken of till now; and will be spoken of to the end of time, because the Lord has so decreed by one of those words not one of which shall fall to the ground. Therefore the fourth Evangelist gives us her *name;*[1] therefore St Matthew and St Mark place the history at the commencement of the Passion, that it may for ever excite, in connection with the sufferings of Christ, the feeling thought, All this He did and suffered for me—what do I for Him? Have I done what I could? Thus was it foreseen and provided: and Mary not only predicted the death and burial of Jesus, but preaches now throughout the world in this Gospel:—His alone be the love of all, let all be done to His honour and in His service, even all charities to the poor.

[1] Here in the repeated narrative, and in ch. xi. 2, presuming an acquaintance with the narrative.

Hosted by Google

LAST PUBLIC DECLARATION CONCERNING HIS COMING DEATH. THE CORN OF WHEAT, AND HIS DISCIPLESHIP; THE PRAYER OF ANGUISH; THE GLORIFICATION; THE BRIEF CONTINUANCE OF THE LIGHT.

(Ch. xii. 23–36.)

All this we embrace under one head; for it is manifest that through all the fulness of these utterances of our Lord, the continuous fundamental thought of His *impending death* may be distinctly traced. As at Bethany in the circle of His friends,—Me ye have not always; so now in the temple aloud before friend and foe,—Yet only a little while is the light with you! And this is the reply to the people's question, how the being taken away from the earth could suit the *Messiah* or the *Son of man;* it comes conclusively after profound sayings concerning the necessity of His death in order to His fruit and glorification, after a public exhibition of the commencing anguish of His conflict, in which the Father promises from heaven and confirms to Him the victory. Thus the correct superscription of the whole is—The Lord's *last public* declaration concerning His death.[1]

St John has recorded after the anointing the Entry into Jerusalem, like the Synoptics; but he has further mentioned the connection between the people's jubilation and the resurrection of Lazarus. The disposition of the Pharisees, as opposed to the people, is here in ver. 19 the same which Lu. xix. 39 reports,—but it is described as more bitter, its internal vexation being more fully exhibited. As already in ch. iii. 26, the disciples of the Baptist hyperbolically complained that all men came to Him; as in Mark i. 37 the disciples announced, all men seek for Thee; so now, but with more appearance of absolute truth, they say that, in spite of all their precautions, *The world is gone after*

[1] More correctly than Lampe's Valedictoria gloriæ Christi in templo manifestatio—although he is so far right as concerns the glory of Christ. It is the last public *discourse* generally (de Wette), only in the Gospel of St John.

Hosted by Google

Him![1] In these words, too, there is an enforced *prediction.* For although the speakers used the expression only according to the current meaning of עוֹלָם and עַלְמָא (everybody, all men)—yet would all the people of the world be drawn to Him, after the vanquishing of the world's Prince by His death. It is most significant that immediately afterwards a pledge and earnest of this is afforded in the desire of *certain Greeks* to see Him.

As the Lord on Monday at the cleansing of the temple testified that this house of God should be called a house of prayer *for all nations* (Mark xi. 17), so even now already on the Sunday, the day of His entry, this had received a fulfilment in the coming of these Gentiles, according to the original decree of 1 Kings viii. 41. We have in our table placed this incident of the Greeks,[2] and what followed it, on the *first day.* Many, indeed, think that it should be placed, if not at the close, yet several days later than the cleansing of the temple, since according to the Synoptics Jesus spoke several times afterwards publicly to the people, whereas here after ver. 36 He departs and hides Himself. But this hiding, the like of which occurs before in St John, must not be regarded as final and definitive; it does not exclude a return to vindicate the temple, and a daily teaching afterwards. Indeed, it thus maintains its *historiographical* truth according to St John's plan, which presupposes and passes by everything else in order to exhibit this scene of the first day as the closing scene, and this discourse as the *last* public declaration in *his* Gospel. For ver. 20, in its close connection with ver. 19, seems still actually to belong to ver. 12.

[1] Properly, follows Him, adheres to Him, forsaking us! Mark the lamenting ἀπῆλθεν, here different from Mar. i. 20. *Ye see it* that Caiaphas is right; we must not let Him thus alone, all men believe in Him! Ye see that *ye do nothing* with your sparing half-measures! Θεωρεῖτε is not, as Erasmus thought, a question. Nor do we prefer with Bengel (on account of πρὸς ἑαυτούς, the ὠφελεῖτε being copied from the θεωρεῖτε) the reading ὠφελοῦμεν (retained in Vulg. and Nonnus, but not in the Syr.). The vigorous party speak to the timid—Follow only the counsel of our prudent high priest! Lange is altogether wrong in thinking it the helpless wrath of impotent opponents, mocking one another.

[2] Whose announcement to the Lord Lange reckons as the culmination of our Lord's influence upon the people on the Monday; while Neander assigns it to the day of entry which excited so much public attention.

Hosted by Google

More important than the definition of the time, which we simply give according to our own unprejudiced view, is the certainty that the *Ἕλληνες* were not Jews (proselytes), not even proselytes of righteousness, but at most proselytes of the gate, and certainly no other than *heathens:* see our observations on ch. vii. 35, and the connection of this event with what follows. The Vulg. translates *Gentiles*, and, according to St John's phrase in ch. xix. 20, they were probably *Greeks* proper.[1] They were *ἐκ τῶν ἀναβαινόντων*, which Glass., Grot., Beng., etc., understand—who were accustomed to come up yearly or oftener;[2] such *σεβόμενοι Ἕλληνες* as are alluded to in the Acts of the Apostles. They came up not, strictly speaking, to keep the feast, but merely *ἵνα προσκυνήσωσι*. It was not, however, the presence of these Gentile guests at the festival which was remarkable and typical—that was a frequent occurrence; but that these heathens should ask just at this time for the Lord, should *desire to see Jesus*. The reason for which they turn to Philip seems to be intimated in the otherwise useless addition, that he was of Bethsaida in *Galilee* (according to the older and wider meaning of this name); either he was known to them as on the borders of their land (against which Bengel objects the *κύριε*, but too critically), or they observed that he understood Greek, or what else may be suggested.[3] Philip, at first, probably, regards their desire as an unreasonable curiosity; he then counts it remarkable, does not venture to repel them, yet still less to bring the matter forward alone:—for would the Messiah, just now proclaimed, and triumphantly entering, receive Gentiles at once into His presence?[4] He therefore confers with his countryman Andrew (ch. i. 44).

We would see Jesus! Words these of deeper than their apparent meaning, and in this typical history of such significance that they have been regarded by a profounder exposition with perfect propriety as an expression of the desire of the whole heathen

[1] Sepp sees in them Armenians, the deputation of King Abgarus!

[2] Lampe: qui non casu aliquo sed fixo more festa Israelis frequentabant.

[3] Nonnus contents himself with an *ἀγχιμόλῳ Φιλίππῳ*, that is, who met them accidentally.

[4] It may be supposed that the Lord was in the interior of the temple, in the court of the women (ch. viii. 20), into which no Gentiles dared to intrude. We do not agree with Luthardt as to the improbability of this.

Hosted by Google

world, and used as a great Missionary text. The simple ἰδεῖν means more in those who now utter it than the ἰδεῖν τίς ἐστι of Zacchæus; it is a modest expression, which Beza rightly interprets—ut privatim convenirent Jesum. The glory so strangely mingled with lowliness at the great entry, the fame of His deeds generally, and of His raising the dead, the hostile influences which they saw at work against Him,—all these combined to stimulate their attention, and to awaken within them a concealed longing after that which they felt wanting, and might find in Him. Thus do they, in the name of their nation, and of all nations, coincide in the desire of the true Israel during all ages from the Father's time (Lu. x. 24), to see what here is to be seen; thus unconsciously do they speak, for the Evangelists' and our right understanding, in the name of the world of heathenism, the highest θέλειν of which in all times has this for its goal—to find and to know *a Jesus*. These men from the West represent at the end of Christ's life that which the wise men from the East represented at its beginning; but those come to the Cross of the King, even as these came to His manger, and receive presently more full intelligence. That which the Lord takes this opportunity to utter is also a *concluding discourse*, even as are the subsequent ones in the former Evangelists; and it was not simply (as B.-Crusius thinks) "according to the design of this fourth Gospel to give the final utterance of Jesus over Judaism," but these words were actually spoken in the spirit of that fundamental idea which runs through the synoptical discourses also—Israel's rejection, and the passing of the kingdom to the Gentiles. Yet Herder, likewise, says not without truth, "Happy John! It was for thee to change the denunciatory symbols of the other Evangelists exhibiting the rejection of the Jewish people, their terrific woes against the Pharisees, into a joyful outlook over all *those* nations whose language thou didst employ! (ch. xii. 37–50). For time had confirmed this wide prospect of Christ."

Ver. 23. Did then the Lord refuse the admission of the Greeks, as Lampe and Kleuker in particular,[1] Meyer, Braune,

[1] "He denied their request, and said: What more would these Greeks see in Me? The time is come for Me to die; and that will be followed by a glorification which strangers and foreigners shall come to know, *without the*

Hosted by Google

and others, suppose?[1] Can this be discerned in His *answer?* We think not, but should be more disposed to interpret it thus: They have come at the right *hour* of My glorification before all the world, they are justified in their desire, in a sense much deeper than they suppose.[2] But even this seems a superficial view of the connection, and a more profound sense must be sought in the fundamental idea of the *glorification of the Son of man* which now fills the soul of our Lord, for the more complete exposition of which, however, we must refer to His second utterance, chap. xiii. 31, 32. The αὐτοῖς after ἀπεκρίνατο appears (as Alford maintains) literally to point to Philip and Andrew alone (in the presence of the other disciples); but we must not forget to take into account the compression and comprehensiveness of St John's historical style at this crisis, the abruptness with which he elevates the hidden meaning and passes by the detail, while preserving of course absolute truth in every incident that he records. It is assumed by many that *after* the Lord had received the Greeks and spoken something to them, He addressed the disciples at more length, as here recorded; but this is contradicted by the strict connection between the ἀπεκρίνατο and the λέγουσι of ver. 22. And are we to suppose St John to have *omitted* what Jesus spake to the Greeks, just at the time when he is making their desire so significantly prominent? We cannot, with our views, avoid referring the αὐτοῖς to the Apostles and the Greeks together. This is an allowable and intelligible conciseness; for the granting of their request is left to be inferred by the attentive reader from the whole scope of our Lord's words. Either the Lord spoke in Greek (as, doubtless, elsewhere often), or the Greeks understood, which may without

necessity of any personal knowledge of Me. For this they could not as yet behold in Me." In his treatise, Johannes, Petrus, und Paulus als Christologen, S. 121.

[1] Laufs (in Stud. u. Krit. 1853, 2, 379) also maintains that Jesus throughout held fast His mission to Israel alone. Schleiermacher, on the other hand, thinks it may be assumed, despite appearances in the narrative, that Jesus did not leave this laudable desire of the Greeks unsatisfied.

[2] Dräseke expounds: "They *should* see Me, they *will* see Me, and *soon* shall they see Me. For the time when the world shall know Me, and shall behold the glory of God manifested in Me, and through Me in mankind, is already come!"

Hosted by Google

scruple be supposed, the popular tongue of Judea. Suffice it that we cannot otherwise understand the Evangelist than that he presupposes the Greeks to be hearing the discourse of Jesus with the rest, and, indeed, that the first portion of it was specially spoken for them. Meyer's note correctly finds here "an instruction designed for the sensuous eye of the Greeks." These guests at the feast were to see the Cross succeeding the triumphant entry—and He presents to their reflections beforehand the solution of the mystery, and a relief to its offence, in His words concerning the grain of wheat. Thus, in a way in which no φιλόσοφος had ever spoken, "He explains to them in brief His *system*."[1] The disciples with the Greeks, and the Greeks with the disciples, expect after the Hosanna still greater things, His universal glorification; and the Lord tells them,—Yea, verily, the hour is come, but My *glorification* will proceed differently from your thoughts of it. As King, rather as the Saviour of all people, shall I soon be glorified: and deeper still,—as the *Son of man*, the normal and central Man, the second Adam. But only by My *dying* will the Divine energy of My humanity be set free and exerted for all mankind.

Ver. 24. For this He does not appeal to the testimony of the prophets (evidence, too, that He is speaking to the Greeks also), but to a secretly prophesying similitude of nature which His words immediately elevate and explain;—of that *nature*, the manifestations of which "the sensuous eye of the Greeks" had profoundly observed without profoundly understanding. For that He signifies Himself by the grain of wheat, is evident from the connection with the former clause, as also from the Ἀμὴν ἀμήν. Yea, not only prophecy in Israel, not only the presentiments and dreams of the heathen world, in which the dim traces of a primeval prophecy are to be discerned, but Nature herself also speaks of the mystery of a redeeming death. That from death generally, which is the wages of sin, and, as properly *death*, came first into the *world* by sin, new life is brought forth—is *now* a phenomenon and symbol everywhere witnessed. But indeed, the caterpillar which becomes a moth, and everything

[1] Lange agrees with this, and regards these words of Jesus as the expression of His first historical introduction and greeting to the Hellenic national spirit—the Gospel for the Greeks.

Hosted by Google

else of the same kind in the animal world, must be regarded as on that account appertaining to the after creation of insects and worms, which was heralded by the change of the serpent-form, and was then the produce of death and corruption.[1] Nevertheless, since the Fall was foreseen, and the redeeming death of the Son of God and son of man already lay in the deep counsels of eternity, the Creator implanted types of it in His pure earthly creation before the Fall. Thus we have here in the Divine ordinance of the *fruit* springing from the *seed*, of the new growth springing from the death of the old, the most primitive prophecy of the mystery of atonement and sacrifice which the pure creation contains. And St John now discloses the inmost kernel of the synoptical seed and harvest parables, and of that first discourse of our Lord concerning sowing and reaping which he himself recorded in ch. iv. 35–38. As firmly established as the covenant of God touching seedtime and harvest, is His counsel touching the death of Christ and the life of the world. As in the *present* process of digestion the food perishes in the stomach to reappear in vivified flesh and blood, so in a symbolical analogy the seed-corn *dies* in order to bring forth fruit. "This holds good generally of all seed (*σίτου ἤ τινος τῶν λοιπῶν*, 1 Cor. xv. 37), but the Lord, not without meaning, specifies grain, the noblest, that of Palestine, *wheat*:—partly, because it is the most important in man's yearly sowing and reaping, and partly, because in fact (as Wesley remarks) the corn of wheat does according to the laws of nature more effectually dissolve and perish in pushing forth the all but invisible germ, than other

[1] The butterfly is not an image of the rejuvenescence of life—"such as may take place in unfallen planets, and might have taken place upon the earth if Adam had not fallen—that form of change by which the paradisaical man might have made the transition from his first into his second life" (Lange). For what purpose would then serve the pupa state, and the chrysalis? We cannot imagine the caterpillars in Paradise. As it respects the "after creation of insects and worms," which my critic Münchmeyer excepts against, this is not my "subjective notion," nor is it an offence against Scripture, but a tradition of old hidden doctrine well known to the learned, as may be seen in V. Meyer's "Bibeldeutungen," S. 129. Bleek (Stud. u. Krit. 1831. 3. S. 498) admits the notion of the Zend Avesta as presupposed in the Pentateuch, which indeed only borders on the truth.

Hosted by Google

kinds of seed which serve it as a permanent covering or as sustenance under the earth.[1]

As in nature, so in the life of man, in the history of nations, of which the Greeks were directly reminded, it is a law of universal operation that out of a self-renouncing, self-sacrificing resignation of all, the benediction of a richer fruitfulness, of a glorified and multiplied existence, springs forth. When that which a man possesses, is—to use the words of Beck (Lehrwissenschaft i. 520)—"not appropriated and enjoyed according to the desire of the present moment, but foregone, as in the case of the seed which is sown, *in reliance upon the Divine law of the benediction of increase, which pervades the whole economy of things*"—there follows most assuredly in every case a rich harvest! We may well suppose these pondering Greeks to have cried—This is the truth, Thy wise saying does verily hold good, Thou wonderful Son of man in Israel! Yet the last and highest illustration of this truth in His own person, they could only, like the Apostles, understand when the great event had taken place. Had this first seed-corn died and fallen into the earth, it would have been *alone* in its own peculiar pre-eminence—just as Jesus stood in His power of the Spirit, His Divine-human life and energy, incommunicable, independent of and above the rest of the human race, before He died. But now what thousand times thousand fold fruit does He bear! From the time that He gave up His soul as an offering for sin, He sees His seed and prolongs His days (Isa. liii. 10). This is what was meant by the צֶמַח of the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Zechariah; and by Ezekiel's מַטַּע לְשֵׁם, ch. xxxiv. 29. And, further, in this word of our Lord lies the germ of St Paul's resurrection doctrine in 1 Cor. xv. They assuredly err, who too narrowly confine the application of the fruit-bearing seed-corn to the *body* of the Lord as expanded, after His glorification, in the Spirit-pervaded congregation of His people;

[1] Singularem id emphasin habere circa *frumenta* notant historiæ naturalis scriptores, quia in eo differunt a cæteris plantis, quod *omnium*(?) aliarum plantarum semina, ubi radices emiserunt, soleant reliquas quoque partes conservare et foras protudere, sed partes *seminis frumenti* sola radice separata, quæ ex terra protuberat, corrumpantur ac pereant. Thus we read in Lampe.

Hosted by Google

it is rather the whole heavenly Son of man as such who voluntarily sinks down *into this earth* of death and the curse, into the domain and destiny of sinful men, not to remain there, but to rise out of it as the glorified Glorifier, the risen Raiser of men. It is true, nevertheless, that as the whole Humanity is intended, so the death and resurrection of the *body* is included; yea, its glorification finds its consummation in corporeity, the fruit-bearing is mediated by that, the Spirit operates and continuously flows forth from that same flesh and blood which became dead, and in which before His death He abode alone, incommunicable and in mysterious exclusiveness apart.[1]

Vers. 25, 26. But now the Lord goes on at once to declare, and this is the immediate design of His present words, that there is no other law of life for His servants and followers; that there is no other way to preserve or redeem again ourselves, than by the self-hating and self-renouncing surrender of ourselves to death. That which holds good of Himself in its own peculiar, unapproachable sense, as of the seed which He alone could sow, the sacrifice which He alone could offer—is not the less on that account a type for us, and is fulfilled in us, even to similar victory and blessedness in His fellowship. This is a thought made familiar to us by many of our Lord's other discourses throughout the Evangelists. Even the first sentence here, in ver. 25, is almost literally the same which is spoken in the Synoptics, Matt. x. 38, 39; Lu. ix. 23, 24, xiv. 26, xvii. 33; so that we have not now to expound it for the first time, but may refer to our exposition of those passages. From this verse we may understand the twofold meaning of ψυχή, as also the true signification of φιλεῖν and μισεῖν, the latter being understood to be the true loving and preserving. Instead of the σώσει and ζωογονήσει of those parallel places, we have here φυλάξει, which defines more sharply the identity of the surrendered and regained life; further, we have here an addition which specifically corresponds with the connection, μισῶν—ἐν τῷ κοσμῷ τούτῳ. For, as Bengel says, *hic mundus* ad *amandam* vitam per se trahit

[1] I am perfectly of the same opinion with Luthardt, that here the necessity of the death of Christ "in order to His self-communication" is maintained. But I cannot admit, with him, that the concomitant reference to the curse and penalty of sin is excluded by this fundamental idea.

Hosted by Google

—consequently this is the strength of warfare and victory, to hate our own life in a world which for ever solicits to mere false self-love, and lives in nothing but the element of self-destruction. Compare the same addition in 1 John iv. 17. In this alone consists the true *following* of Christ, that which He requires of all who are willing to *serve* Him, to honour His supremacy, and pledge themselves to His rule. I will have, He says, no other "serving" than this following,—and in the second clause, that which contains His promise, He means by διάκονος and ἐὰν διακονῇ only *this* service in the genuine spirit of truth.

Where I am, there shall or there should also My servant be! It is needlessly disputed whether this is an added condition or a promise and reward, for in the church of all ages the Spirit has taught the double application of this word. For this is one of those ambiguous sayings which embrace in the very expression used the transitional idea of the thing expressed:—here as there, now as then, in the cross and death as in glory and life, in the conflict and in the victory, in abasement as in exaltation, the true servant of Jesus must be and will *be there, where He is.* The two senses pass into one another, the requirement itself becomes a promise, includes it as the sweet kernel within the bitter shell; this is so true, that, as all right experience attests, we, *as* followers, and bearers likewise of the cross of Christ, are conscious of having our conversation with Him already in heaven. But to weak faith, which can scarcely in the gloom of conflict grasp this truth, the words just as they stand have the force of a mightily convincing consolation:—Art thou not in His way of reproach, suffering, and death, in this present world, wilt thou not be found there with Him, where He is? What more wouldst thou have? Thou must tarry where He tarried, and attain to the same goal by the same way! Ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ has not, as is commonly said, precisely the same force as in chs. xiv. 3, xvii. 24,—but this Future is here first regarded as growing out of the immediately following Present in the νῦν of ver. 27. When the Lord would utter the *promise* unrestrictedly, and in all its emphasis of attractiveness, He assures to *every one* (without distinction, τίς) who serveth Him, the great prerogative, nowhere else so fully expressed as here, τιμήσει αὐτὸν ὁ πατήρ. This is the correlative of His own δοξασθῆναι: honour and glorious

Hosted by Google

manifestation in addition to the saved and regained life. What shall be done to the man whom the blessed and only Potentate, the King of all kings, the Creator of the universe, *the Father* of Jesus Christ delighteth to *honour* to the utmost? (Esther vi. 6.) Here are all our anticipations weak before the unimaginable height and glory of our assured hope.

Vers. 27, 28. But there is a sudden change in the intense thought and feeling of our Lord, such as we often find Him exhibiting in testimony that the Son of man is one of ourselves (but most often towards the close, and in St John especially); and *now* the Lord is seized by an affrighting apprehension of that conflict of suffering and death unto victory, of which He had so serenely spoken. Not "confounded" (as the Berlenb. Bib. translates), but *amazed* is His soul, moved to its depths by the disquietude and terror of the coming *hour*. We have here a prelude to Gethsemane, the lamentation, the petition, the resignation, all now even as then. St John's record of this crisis of foretaste is as real as the synoptical record of the subsequent consummate conflict; the two accounts explain and supplement each other. We have no more now to say, preparatorily to a deeper exposition when we reach Gethsemane, than that it must have been more than a mere mortal apprehension of death; it must have been a conflict and agitation of a peculiar and unshared kind, which could thus disturb the Son of God as the Son of man while in the midst of His testimony to His own δόξα! And—"He lets us know His feelings," tells us plainly for a witness to all people (ver. 29)—Now is my soul troubled! Not as if the overpowering might of passion had constrained this utterance:—we see that He afterwards in perfect self-possession commanded the outburst of His sorrow and dismay, until the time and the witnesses were appointed. (Matt. xxvi. 36, 37.) But it is His *will* not to conceal it, and even this mightiest passion is exhibited in the calmness of connected, progressive, and measured words.

All the typical appeals and supplications of the Psalms, in which, with various application, the cry so often recurs, My soul is cast down (Ps. xlii. 7 literally), and, Lord, be Thou my helper—reach in the lips of our Lord their full, distinctive, *Messianic meaning*. And it is not without significance, that

Hosted by Google

here and at Gethsemane alone does Jesus say concerning Himself, *My soul*—which is to be distinguished from His *spirit*. Father, save Me! has been by many punctuated and explained as still a *question*;[1] but to us this is quite improper, as well as unreal. To our feeling, it is inharmonious to make a prayer, which springs from the deepest impulse, begin with a question —*Should I* so pray? so speak? Further, the Lord does not speak in any doubt or uncertainty—What should I *choose?* but merely—What shall I *say?* But this must be rightly understood! The *two opposites* pressed hard upon Him, in an infinitely deeper and more actual sense than upon His Apostle afterwards:—the cry for help, and submission to the Father's counsel. (Bengel: concurrebat horror mortis et ardor obedientiæ.) Human language is not sufficient for the *combined utterance* of both, as both were perfectly combined in Him,—hence the τί εἴπω. Therefore He utters them one after the other, the one being as earnest and solemnly intended as the other.[2] First the human dismay—Help *Me!* but immediately follows the cry, which coincides with the perfect submission of Gethsemane,—Glorify *Thy* name! The intermediate foundation of both is a clause which on account of the διὰ τοῦτο demands a nearer contemplation.

It does not admit of question, after the evidence of all the Evangelists, that by *this hour* we must understand the time which had been so often declared to be *not yet* come, but which had now arrived in its immediate preparatory tokens; the time, that is, of His final specific suffering unto death, of His distinctive atoning passion. Certainly, there lies in the expression itself an allusion to the *transitoriness* of even this crisis, as παραυτίκα ἐλαφρὸν (2 Cor. iv. 17) in comparison with eternity; but, on the other hand, the same word describes the oppressive might of the temporal *present*, of the νῦν, into which the Son of God appearing as the Son of man in earthly life and earthly expe-

[1] Griesbach, Knapp, Schott, Hahn, Schulz, Lachmann do so; and Schleiermacher adopts this interpretation.

[2] Lampe: Sed tamen ab alterâ quoque parte non caret difficultate, si admittitur *interrogatio*, quod tum Jesus videatur *corrigere* velle verba, *quæ in se erant æquissima*, quæque argumentum precum Messiæ secundum prophetias esse debebant.

Hosted by Google

rience had so profoundly sunk, that there remains for Him only a cup which He must drink to the last drops, a baptism of all but overwhelming violence from without;[1] and not only so, but the peculiar and unexampled intensity of this death-passion of the Living One, of this sin-bearing of the Holy One, from the might of which alone our suffering derives its virtue to insure our δόξα, exhibits to us *in this suffering* a corresponding—*καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος θλίψεως*. This emphatic significance of the word *ὥρα* of itself confutes the view which Baum.-Crusius gives of the intermediate clause:—"Here must *αὕτη ἡ ὥρα* mean something different, namely, the present time *of His life*, and the meaning is, The circumstances of My whole lifetime have led Me into a constant conflict with sufferings!" Oh no, this meaning is quite discordant with this normal language of the Spirit; and we nowhere find in Scripture that the entire life of any man is termed an hour;[2] most assuredly *this hour* here is the same in the second as in the first clause, and that distinction disturbs the impressive emphasis of the connection. As certainly as the *νῦν τετάρακται* holds its truth, even so the Lord may justly say thereof—*ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ὥραν ταύτην*. But what means the *διὰ τοῦτο* therewith? The expression of emotion is pregnant and hints out its meaning. Are we to understand, with Olshausen, "in order to redeem mankind, and finish My work?" That involves something not *now* expressed, hinted at only in the much fruit of ver. 24; but the *τοῦτο* must mean something nearer and more obvious, if it were only because of its condensed and pregnant utterance. Consequently, that also is too far-fetched, which Lücke supplies:—the hour that the Son of man should be glorified: and we agree with Kling[3] in rejecting this, and clinging to Bengel's perfectly unexceptionable view—Propterea *veni* in hanc horam, ut venirem in hanc horam, eamque exantlarem. Thus only, according to our feeling, is justice done to this most impressive utterance, in which the most vehement *ταράσσεσθαι* is accompanied by the most tranquil self-possession, and which has no other meaning than the *οὕτω δεῖ γενέσθαι* of Matt. xxvi. 54.

[1] Compare our observations upon the *cup* and *baptism* in vol. iii.

[2] Although Klopstock's well-known hymn terms this life only a brief *hour*—in contrast with eternity.

[3] Stud. u. Krit. 1836, 3. 675.

Hosted by Google

And the Berlenb. Bible is not far amiss—"Would I be saved out of this hour, I must first enter thoroughly into it." Luthardt too, He says now, "for this cause, that I might drink of this cup to the dregs, and exhaust it, have I placed it to My lips." In *this* application, finally, are we to seek the depth of the meaning, as Bengel intimates it by his *exantlare*. The διὰ τοῦτο, that is, refers immediately to the preceding σῶσόν με; the thought which harmonises the great contradiction, which unites in one the supplication for help and the resignation to God's will, and which perfectly responds to the τί εἴπω; is no other than this:—The entering into this hour is the being brought out of it, the suffering is itself the deliverance! And thus the tranquillised soul reposes in the prelude of victory which sounds in the final clause,—Father, glorify only Thy name! Certainly, there is in these words also the feeling which Bengel expresses —quovis impendio mei, not as My *horror mortis* would with its σῶσόν με, but as Thou wilt! Nevertheless, this glorification is not of the Father Himself, which first fully comes out in ch. xvii. 1, 4 (see, however, ver. 6); but of His *name*, of that revelation of Himself in the Son which again is one with the glorification of the Son of man, ver. 23. This the Son knoweth, and thus He returns at the close of His words to the thought with which they began.

The significance of this crisis is great, and is but dimly apprehended by those who see here only a parenthetical occurrence, having its origin in a momentary emotion. The *three* voices from heaven, by which the Father spake over the Son, indicate to us the right way to regard it. At the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the Messiah's course respectively, there was given to Jesus such a high and most distinctive attestation; and all three times in relation to the assumption on the part of the self-sacrificing Son of His *destiny of death*. "The third time had Jesus now solemnly announced His destiny of death; as first in the presence of the Baptist, the second time before the Lawgiver and the Prophet of the Old Testament, so now in the holy place of sacrifice itself, in the tabernacle of

Hosted by Google

God. And the third time does the voice like thunder resound, by which the Father accredits the Son and justifies His work." (Ebrard.) Moreover, the progression in *publicity* which is evident in these three occasions must be distinctly noted; the perfect contrast between *this* voice as uttered before all the people in the temple, and the first still revelation between John and Jesus alone.

We shall not involve ourselves with the question, which has been very foolishly dealt with by too many, as to whether the later and dubious doctrine of the Jews concerning the Bath Kol, audible since the period of the second temple, is to be introduced here. This notion of the Rabbins had by no means become an article of popular faith, for the people on the present occasion think of nothing of the kind. We must not here, any more than at the Baptism and Transfiguration (let not these parallels be overlooked!), think of any mere omen-like קוֹל or *βροντή*, the signification of which in the Spirit (the daughter of this voice) Jesus might first have uttered or heard. The assumption of an immediate voice from heaven does *not* rest (as de Wette says, Stud. u. Krit. 1834. 4. 939) upon an "indistinctness of thought;" but upon the plain and certain record of St John, whose words allow no other supposition than that it *was* an actual voice, uttering the cited words. We may admit the circumstance, related with equal plainness, that a portion of the people nevertheless heard only thunder, without by any means admitting "that the people's sense of hearing declares it to have been no other than a sound like thunder." This was, indeed, the sense of the most unsusceptible of *the people;* but others, though de Wette rejects them, heard what they term an actual λελάληκεν, ascribed by them to an angel. That *St John* heard and understood the words of the *φωνή* is to be gathered from his plain statement, which records them with the same historical simplicity as all the rest; and when he says that only the people misunderstood the sound, it is implied that all the *disciples*, at least, understood them equally with himself.[1] "The

[1] Klee: "The disciples doubtless understood: otherwise St John would not have failed to remark that they did not hear or apprehend the words. It is the people whom he exhibits as entirely or partially mistaking the sound."

Hosted by Google

Evangelist declares it to have been no more than a supposition of the people, that thunder had been heard"—as Kling very properly says. The loud and awful voice was, indeed, "like thunder;" but it was at the same time an articulately speaking *voice*. Now such an objective mystery as this, a sound from heaven, from the world of spirit, demands most assuredly a specific susceptibility on the part of earthly man, if it is to be rightly perceived and apprehended by him:[1] *hence* the half-hearing of the people then, just as in the present day, when, amid the plainest and most articulate preaching of the glorification of Jesus in the word and power of the Holy Ghost—an ὄχλος ἑστὼς καὶ ἀκούσας often hears nothing but a *thundering*, a mere *predication*. For, as Hamann says, "before men will see (hear) and believe in God, they will resort to all kinds of imaginations of thunder and angels." A mere literal thunder, however, as the voice of the Father over the Son, which He must then interpret as in the case of the Bath Kol of the Jews, is altogether derogatory to His honour: he who feels not this is beyond the reach of argument.

The words themselves, as they give an assuring answer, not, however, with a simple δοξάσω but with καὶ ἐδόξασα as the foundation of that, have been for the most part either wholly misunderstood or interpreted in a very narrow way. That view of them which, under various modifications, refers the καὶ ἐδόξασα to the present crisis, has a strong appearance of profundity. Bengel: "By the word *I have glorified*, the entrance of Christ upon that hour is accepted; by the word *I will glorify*, there is promised the glorification of the Father's name through the glorification of Christ by His passion. To the twofold speech of Jesus, the twofold reply of the Father corresponds." So von Gerlach, with a somewhat different application: "The Father had already glorified His name *internally*, through the perfect *obedience* of the Son, who had surrendered Himself up in perfect sacrifice through His whole life, and now once more most fully; and He would glorify it again when this offering of the Son should be *externally perfected*, and He Himself, through

[1] "The necessity of a fit disposition of the organ, however, does not by any means remove an objective matter into the domain of the internal."

Hosted by Google

His resurrection and ascension, should be acknowledged before all the world." And Brandt goes still further: assuming that the name was already glorified in the present victory of the wrestling spirit of Jesus, and that "the True and Faithful One now assured Him that in His future similar, but more sharp and continuing agony, He should once more most gloriously conquer." Whatever semblance of right all this may have, we regard it as too petty an interpretation of the Father's voice, which now (as on the two former occasions) must embrace and express the whole eternal relation, entering into time and passing beyond it, of the Father to the Son; and every immediate reference to this crisis itself must be too narrow, for the καὶ ἐδόξασα καὶ δοξάσω has a tone which comprehends *all* the Past and the Future. Thus it is no remembrancer of this or that glorification which had already taken place; for (as B.-Crusius rightly says) "the ἐδόξασα and δοξάσω are not to be referred to any *single* circumstance past or future, but to the whole process of the great events." Nor can we understand, with Lange, "in the New Covenant as in the Old;" or, as Schleiermacher better puts it, the contrast between all the past of Divine manifestation and the kingdom which should begin with the death of Christ. This reduplicated word, used emphatically on account of the δόξασον to which it responds, is fundamentally one with the former voices which testified generally—*Thou art My Son!*[1] Thou art My Son, in whom I have ever, since Thou wert, glorified My name; consequently, therefore, as certainly will I glorify it in Thee through Thy *now* beginning passion. Thus, it is the distinction between the past and the future which is here the great *turning-point;* the πάλιν also is no mere continuous or repeating עוֹד, but a simple corroboration; since the true and complete glorification, the renewal and increase, rather the consummation of the former glorification, is still in reversion, as Jesus has said.

Ver. 30. In this simple word of our Lord, which may be read

[1] But the Thou of this address is the Son of man, though as the expected, secretly present angel of the covenant, mediating the revelation of every age. Augustin goes too far back when he adds to the ἐδόξασα—antequam facerem mundum, taken from ch. xvii. 5, to which this belongs. Comp. rather Ps. xxii. 10, 11.

Hosted by Google

too lightly, there are two things which must be carefully observed. In the first place, the "not" is not an unconditional negation, but only relatively so—*not alone*, or *not so much*. For it is not His design to deny that the voice had a purpose also for Himself, invigorating Him and leading Him onward to the great hour; He does not really contradict (though this has been affirmed) the people's αὐτῷ λελάληκεν, for this would involve an application quite inconsistent with His sacred humility, and which we leave such as Strauss to find in it,—But take care not to think that I find necessary for My own person any such assurance and consolation! Had He not prayed? And does not the confirming answer rejoice the Petitioner, even though His perfect assurance from beginning to end lay in the Amen of His own prayer? But it is the publicity and solemnity of *this* last voice from heaven which the Lord now makes so prominent and urges upon their attention. He refutes their words about the thunder by the repeated φωνή: but He does not go on to correct their error as to whether an angel, or the Father whom He addressed, had spoken; for that would have been a criticism of their words unseemly at such a crisis, the influence of which should still work on. It is this influence alone which He would carry on and guide. *Although* the people had not heard and understood it, He nevertheless assures them—and this is the second point—that it came for their sake! His δι' ὑμᾶς does not refer merely to the more susceptible among them, the commencing disciples, but He makes all "in a certain sense responsible for their understanding, because they might have been able to understand." (v. Gerlach.) This saying may be extended to all the signs and attestations of Jesus which had taken place; all *for our sakes*, that we might hear and believe! But we must carefully apprehend the relative bearings of our Lord's manner of speaking here, as it is condescendingly adapted to the children of men. Essentially and supremely, *all things* are and take place for the *Father's* sake (Heb. ii. 10; Rom. xi. 36), for the glorification of *His* name—the redemption as well as the creation of the world. Thus the Son had just before spoken, for thus only *it became Him* to speak. Nevertheless, He did not the less on that account speak also of His own glorification, yea, He began with that; for all must honour the Son

Hosted by Google

even as they honour the Father, the honour of God consists conclusively in this, that the Father is honoured in the Son (ch. v. 23, xi. 4, xiv. 13). The passage of ch. xvii. is finally condensed into that one single petition, And now glorify Thou —*Me!* Therefore we rightly supplement the answering voice thus—ἐδόξασα καὶ δοξάσω μου τὸ ὄνομα; yet it is not without significance that these last words are wanting, for the answer comprehensively holds good also of ver. 23, and the *absolute* δοξάζειν signifies—Me in Thee and Thee in Me! This is that perfect intercommunion of working and love, by which the Son will glorify the Father and the Father the Son. But, once more, this δόξα is revealed and perfected in the blessedness of the redeemed, on whom the Father confers the honour (τιμήσει, ver. 26), of being capable eternally to honour Him in the Son with body, soul, and spirit. Thus, as Jesus previously thought, in His διὰ τοῦτο, of the immediate necessity of His redeeming passion (*this hour*), as the way of transition to eternal glory, and rested serenely in this; so now the observation of the unintelligent people upon the voice brings before Him the *third* fundamental thought, to which He in perfect self-devotion condescended, or, as we may say with equal propriety, in pure and most elevated contemplation raised Himself. Regarding now a world of sinners all was one δι' ὑμᾶς. And *to this*, too, the salvation of the world, is subordinated His δι' ἐμέ, to be found again; even as the σῶσόν με was merged in the honour of the Father. By all this we may clearly comprehend how the deep internal current of our Lord's thought made it necessary that He should now go on to speak of that redemption of the world which His sufferings and self-renunciation should effect.

Ver. 31. But in connection with this comes forward, as naturally as necessarily, the thought of the power of Satan, the false god and anti-god, which is to be abolished. Our dogmatic theology has much work to do, before full justice will be done to *all* the aspects and relations of the mystery of the Cross, as they appear interspersed through Scripture; before they are all gathered into one unity, without the undue preponderance of any,—the revelation of love, the vindication of right, the reconciliation between the world and God, the mortification of sin in the flesh, the abolition of death, the breaking down of Satan's

Hosted by Google

power. This last aspect of it was more fundamentally viewed and exhibited in the ancient teaching of the church than in modern times; and we may refer in illustration to Oetinger's remark on Luther's Catechism: "Thus the simple notion of *Redemption* is the swallowing up all that in victory which is contrary to man, and caused by Satan."[1] Compare Heb. ii. 14; Col. i. 13, ii. 14, 15, etc., etc.

The *νῦν* is the same immediately impending, already commencing *now* as in ver. 27. The world is not, indeed, to be damningly judged, but redeemed and saved: this very redemption, however, is itself a *judgment*. They miss altogether the deep meaning of this word in this place, who arbitrarily make *κρίσις* without any qualification mean—setting free, salvation, justification. Thus Augustin understood it of the separation of those who were delivered from the devil; Chrysostom substituted an *ἐκδικήσεται ὁ κόσμος ἅπας*; and Cyril, *ἀπαλλάττεσθαι τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου πλεονεξίας*. (See in Klee.) Grotius resorted to an unsound philology—*κρίνειν* sæpe apud Hebræos est in libertatem vindicare. Id quim faciebant שׁוֹפְטִים. No! ch. xvi. 11 must be taken in connection with the present declaration, and consequently the ungodly world is in a certain sense *judged* in its prince, even while it is saved. Thus we cannot solve it by that other interpretation, which is resorted to by most practical expositors; as by Bengel—"*κόσμου* is the genitive of the object; the judgment concerning the world, is as to *who is hereafter to be the rightful possessor of the world*." Assuredly, there is such a process of decision as to who should possess the world, and the judgment becomes for the world an emancipating judgment of grace; yet no otherwise than because the world, *as* the world and ungodly, is subjected to judgment with Satan; inasmuch, that is, as its sin, that which Satan has in it, is judicially abolished and thrown back to Satan whence it came.[2]

[1] In the Wörterbuch s. v. Auskaufen, S. 53. Similarly S. 177 s. v. Erlösung, "In the great word Redemption what a number of thoughts come together! Christ has redeemed us from future condemnation and wrath, from the law, from our vain conversation, from death and from the devil."

[2] Which, however, is not the same with Hilgenfeld's interpolated thought —Now is the world's judgment, and not hereafter only.

Hosted by Google

Prince of this world is an appellation which now first comes forward, but with which we shall hereafter become more familiar: corresponding to the Rabbinical שַׂר הָעוֹלָם, for the form of our Lord's doctrine lays hold of every element of truth which had been developed rightly from the Old Testament. The Lord further speaks of the devil without any direct external inducement, from His own spontaneous impulse: and His saying is uttered not simply before the disciples and the people, but before the *Greeks*, who, as we found before, were still His hearers, and would be the specific representatives of that which *κόσμος* to Jewish ears would signify. The glance over the *world of heathenism* is continued in the *πάντας* of the following verse. It has been rightly observed that never had the prince of this world swayed a more unrestricted and uninterrupted dominion upon the earth, than was exhibited in Heathenism and Judaism at the time when Christ came. But this is the great *νῦν*, when and from which time forwards, he should be cast out! There is a special emphasis in the *ἔξω* as added to *ἐκβληθήσεται*—but *from what?* Theophylact held fast the superficial meaning which a figurative acceptation gives—the casting out from the place of judgment of one who is cast in the suit.[1] In the opposite extreme, something quite inappropriate to our passage (see the exposition in Lu. x. 18) has been found in it by those whom the reading *κάτω* instead of *ἔξω* has misled, and who understand the casting down from heaven. (Crusius; out of the *πανήγυρις ἀγγέλων* [Heb. xii. 22, 23].) Better than this would be the simple *out of the world*, the occupant of which he had hitherto been; out of it as "his territory" (which Luthardt sanctions): —for this is strictly true. Yet since, as the Lord has just said, the world itself in a certain sense is *also* "judged," that modification of the thought is the only perfectly appropriate one, which Grotius (after Euthymius and others) refers to—*ἔξω* ex voce *ἄρχων* interpretandum, *ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς*.[2] Of course, it is self-evident that this future, as in the entire work of redemption, is already fulfilled only *jure et potentia;* it is to be fulfilled *facto*

[1] "Removed from the Judge's presence"—as Hofmann (Schriftbeweis i. 396) weakens it.

[2] Nor can we understand why Luthardt should declare this to be "artificial," since "territory" here can be no other than territory of dominion.

Hosted by Google

et actu gradually, and by a very long progression. This casting out of him who is cast out goes on from age to age down to the final victory.

Ver. 32. The ἐγώ of our Lord takes the place of the ejected ἄρχων; but His new ἐξουσία πάσης σαρκός (ch. xvii. 2), is no other than an *attractive* power exercised upon all whom the usurper can now no longer keep back, if *they* refuse him, and follow the Lord's drawing. That all men might be drawn towards Him, is the fruit and consequence of the *death* of Jesus, as was already declared in ch. x. 15, 16, of that same death which has been the subject of discourse since ver. 23. It is most certain, consequently, that the *lifting up* here, as in ch. iii. 14, and ch. viii. 28, has as direct reference to the dying itself, as to the glorification and universal exhibition attendant upon that dying; and it plainly alludes, as we saw upon those passages, to the *cross*. But it is doing injustice to the Evangelist, to regard his interpretation in ver. 33 as being restricted to the crucifixion alone, especially to the mere externality of the exaltation upon the cross. (Baum.-Crusius: "The Evangelist deems the second signification the only one.") For this σημαίνων[1] which he uses, when compared with ch. xxi. 18, 19, Rev. i. 1, does not mean a plain declaration (as when employed by St Luke in Acts xxv. 27, and xi. 28), but a hinted intimation; and hence the London Heb. New Test., which we so often quote, well renders it by לְהָרְמִין. Nor can we doubt, when we enter as we ought into the profound meaning of St John's words, that in this ποίῳ θανάτῳ (which, indeed, in ch. xviii. 32 does refer only to the kind of death) he designs comprehensively to express all that our Lord had said concerning the significance, the power, and the fruit of His death.[2] For the being lifted up *from the earth* indicates, as

[1] Concerning which Baum.-Crusius arbitrarily decides that "it has the force here neither of an obscure, nor of an incidental, allusion."

[2] Lampe: Phrasis ποίῳ θανατῷ non nude significat *quo genere mortis*, sed in sensu latiori *qualitatem* mortis, etiam *internam* involvit, adeoque ad fructus etiam hujus mortis respicit. Münchmeyer, on the contrary, insists that the ἀποθνήσκειν permits us to think *only* of the manner of death — the significance, power, and fruit of that death being altogether out of the question here! I envy not such a perverse and wilful spirit of exposition. Even the ancient Nonnus inserted — ποίῳ ζωαρκεῖ ποτμῳ.

Hosted by Google

the Lord here uses it, more plainly than the mere *ὑψωθῆναι* and *ὑψώσητε* which had been used before, an emancipating and glorifying power in His death:—the falling *into the earth* of the grain of wheat is now marvellously at the same time an exaltation above the earth, and *this* is symbolically represented by the *cross*. The tree of the curse and of death planted in the earth remains not withered and dry, but grows up towards heaven as the tree of life and blessing.

The reading *πάντα*, which, as followed by the Vulg., Augustin so strangely expounds, is defended now by no one. As in ch. xiii. 3 *πάντα* alone could be read, so here it must be *πάντας*. They *all* are as personal as the prince of this world; they are his subjects now set free, especially the Greeks and heathens:—and thus does the Lord give the late answer for ver. 21. He who being crucified, and by the cross lifted up to heaven, exhibits Himself by His word and Spirit to the souls of men as crucified for them, in all the love of redemption, draws them to Himself by the might of His love: a truth which has in modern times assumed a classical form to all the friends of Missions in the well-known sermon of James of Birmingham on the Attraction of the cross.[1] I will draw them *unto Me:* and this means ultimately, away from the earth into heavenly places (Nonnus: *ἐς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν*); yet only through the cross, and therefore first of all to Me on the cross.[2] This is in the sense of "where I am" (ver. 26). That before the glorification of Christ (to the world and the individual heart) the Father pædagogically and preparatorily draws to the Son, while afterwards *the Son Himself* draws immediately, is a distinction of great moment, as we have observed upon ch. vi. 44. Finally, let it be clearly apprehended that the promised drawing *of all men* does not insure to all men that they must and will come; for the *drawing* is no *enforcement*, as chap. vi. made clear. Schleiermacher would, indeed, understand the word without any restriction, and founds upon it the hope that the Lord will actually yet redeem all men, and bring the entire human race to salvation. Even Olshausen is disposed to concede that the "draw *to Myself*" might seem to allow no room for the opposing energy of man, and thus give plausibility

[1] Translated into German at Nürnberg, 1820.

[2] Dräseke: "The church is built up around the Cross."

Hosted by Google

to the doctrine of universal restoration. But let the emphasis be laid upon the first word "*draw* to Myself," and all is plain. Does not the Lord actually draw all men? Does not the absolute predestination theory contradict itself necessarily in all practical preaching, *which is sent* unto all? Does not Augustin himself say—*Si non traheris, roga ut traharis*—?

That the people did certainly understand the Lord's words of *dying*, is made plain by His subsequent "yet a little while." They had heard out of the *law*, that is, here out of *Scripture* generally, something concerning the Messiah's eternal continuance; and, rightly interpreted, their supposition was correct. But they did not hear it aright; and as they now (let it be noted!) take it for granted that Christ is speaking of Himself as the *Messiah*, they find it hard to reconcile His being taken away and lifted up with this abiding. They tell Him this, not apparently with any malicious motive, but as a confident appeal to Him springing from eagerness to know. For μένειν in popular use equivalent to not dying, comp. chap. xxi., xxii., xxiii. It has been needlessly sought to find particular passages of Scripture to which the people might refer. Surenhusen supposed that Ps. cx. 4 must be joined with Dan. ii. 44, vii. 13, 14; the eternal priesthood with the eternal kingdom. But there needs not at the outset any particular expressions to establish the universal teaching of Scripture according to the Jewish notion,—that the Messiah would set up a permanent earthly kingdom, and consequently (by a very natural inference) remain ever upon earth.[1] Yet the saying "Son of man" does seem to refer more directly to Daniel; and that even the people assume *Christ* and Son of man to be synonymous, is very important for the establishment of the meaning of the latter phrase as used by Jesus. He had not indeed *now* said, according to St John, If the Son of man be lifted up; but ver. 23 had set out with this expression, and the people had been by Himself accustomed to understand this as a designation of His own person. They are reminded, consequently, of the words of ver. 23; yet this is not all that we are to assume, as Luthardt thinks, who denies all

[1] For the confusion of the Rabbins upon the question, to their blindness incapable of solution, Whether the Messiah should die? compare Eisenmenger Th. ii. Kap. 15, especially from S. 812 onwards.

Hosted by Google

reference to Dan. vii. For how should that be? This great central prediction was assuredly known mediately to the people, even as the Lord's discourse had pointed to it: only on this supposition could they have understood ver. 23 of the Messiah. They, therefore, conclusively ask,—Or dost Thou speak in this δεῖ ὑψωθῆναι (not a literal quotation of His words, and remarkably coinciding with chap. iii. 14) of a Son of man who is *not* the Christ? Thus we have not, however, hitherto understood Thee (and the Scripture):—resolve us this mystery!

Vers. 35, 36. He does not resolve it to them, nor can He until the great sequel brings its great solution; therefore His answer is not properly speaking an answer, but a reference to the present duty of faith—Only use My light, and all things will soon be clear to you![1] He does not say expressly, either that their opinion concerning the eternal abiding of the Messiah was false, or that it was true: for it is both, according as it is understood. He only confirms the assurance that He Himself will soon go away. His words refer to, and blend, the sayings of chap. vii. 33 and chap. viii. 12; while they are, to the people, the complement of what He had said in chap. ix. 4, 5. He Himself worketh unweariedly as the Light, so long as He is in the world; but they also, on their part, should do the same:—*Your* work is to use the light, by a trusting and obedient *walking* in the way which that light marks out. It is as certain that μεθ' ὑμῶν is a gloss taken from chap. xiii. 33, as it is that ἐν ὑμῖν must here be translated first of all—among you: comp. ἐν αὐτοῖς, chap. xv. 24, with ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν here, chap. xii. 37. It is, however, no other than a condescending, though deeply significant, manner of speaking which attributes to them a certain *having* of the light which was only externally offered to them. In this gracious admission there lies, further, the solemn truth, that *for Israel* the prophetic office of Christ must pave the way for the influence of His priestly office. Whosoever altogether failed to hear Him, as He taught and testified, *to him* no new light of life would break forth from the redeeming death; but that which was to the Gentiles a gospel, became to the previously unbelieving Jews, as the result on the mass bore witness,

[1] "He demands from them deeds, disputings served no purpose." (Braune.)

Hosted by Google

no other than—the loss of light, the entire lapse into darkness (Rom. xi. 15). The same Paul who was sent among the Gentiles with the word of the Cross, to open their eyes, that they should turn from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, had concerning Jerusalem already received the command, Make haste and get thee quickly out: for they will not receive thy testimony concerning Me, as they did not receive Mine concerning Myself. (Acts xxvi. 18, xxii. 18.) A similar result follows wherever a preparatory word of the Lord shines for a while, in order to make and make manifest the distinction between faith and unbelief; and this gives a general application to this much-used warning of our Lord. For the darkness into which the rejected light turns, compare the quite analogous expression in Jer. xiii. 16; and for the walking in the light which goes before (at that time, the light of Scripture and the law), the apocryphal passage, Baruch iv. 1, 2. He who walks in darkness, or would foolishly walk in it, cannot do so, for he seeth not and therefore knoweth not where he goeth: he runneth blindly into the ruin which yawns before his sin. Thus did the Jewish people fall into judgment through their continuous rebellion against God and man; and so is it generally with every man who has neglected the day of his light.

With the saying of ver. 36, Luther took his farewell as translator of Scripture: he placed it at the conclusion of the warning which he appended to the edition of the New Testament of 1545. The *believing* in the light is the preliminary foundation for the *walking;* but that we become *children of light* is the result of the faith which walketh and approveth itself in obedience. *Sons* or *children* of light is not a mere Hebraism; this would be just equivalent to the previous *having,* which indicated only a certain relation to the light: but a new γενεά was to be born of the light.

Hosted by Google

THE EVANGELIST'S SUMMARY OF THE PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF JESUS.

(Ch. xii. 44–50.)

An orthodox harmony of the first three Evangelists, in combination with the fourth, must show, as we said before, that ἀπελθὼν ἐκρύβη does not imply that our Lord from this time forth uttered no further words in public, and was no more seen by the people. The true parallels are Matt. xxi. 17; Lu. xxi. 37. But it appears to us incredible, taking into account the plan of St John's whole Gospel, and his own final reflections previously, that the Lord should immediately afterwards, and in connection with His concealment, utter aloud the words which follow from ver. 44 to ver. 50. For, from ver. 37 onwards, *the Evangelist* comes forward with his *epilogue* and concluding observations, *because* the Lord had *retired;* and these concluding observations plainly extend in one connection to the end of the chapter. If they are supposed to end with ver. 43, it even then must appear altogether contrary to historical narrative generally, and to St John's in particular, to introduce *after* such a conclusion, and without any further introductory statement, an actual discourse of our Lord. But the final reflection upon the self-condemned unbelief of the Jews, the fruitlessness of the labours of Jesus on the whole, embraces obviously all that follows: it is divided into two parts, speaking first of the many and great *miracles*,[1] of which St John (the others chs. ii. 23, vii. 31, x. 32, xx. 30, being presupposed) had only adduced some of the greatest, and then of the testimony of His *words* by those miracles confirmed, *they* being in themselves the main matter of this spiritual Gospel, as of the Gospel generally. Or, we may say, first of the whole manifestation of His *person* as such, in which the *arm* of the Lord was revealed, yea, in which the *glory of God* was to be seen as certainly as it had been seen by Isaiah (chs. ii. 11, and x. 40, being combined); then, of the *preaching*, ἀκοή or שְׁמוּעָה which

[1] For that in τοσαῦτα a *tanta* must be added to the *tot* (comp. Matt. viii. 10; Lu. vii. 9), is denied by Luthardt without any reason.

Hosted by Google

is the distinctive test and spring of faith, and the right disposition for which is exhibited in the prophetic quotation of ver. 38. For to believe in σημεῖα without the word is a mere negation, since it is the word accompanying, or rather by them accompanied, which elevates them into signs and witnesses which have a meaning. The Jews *could* not believe, because they would not from the beginning and still would not (Theophylact; τὸ οὐκ ἠδύναντο ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐκ ἤθελον); and that is the predicted judicial hardening, in the fulfilment of which unbelief itself, far from leading us astray, becomes only a new argument of faith. We have already said, upon Matt. xiii. 14, 15, all that is necessary upon the quotation from Isaiah.[1] Of the *unbelieving* there are, however, according to the little understood meaning of St John, *two* classes; for he regards the altogether unsusceptible and hardened as the great mass, and then adds to them in ver. 42 those who *confess not* in spite of their ἐπίστευσαν. For he knows no other genuine and perfect faith than that which confesses.[2] The ὅμως before μέντοι we do not regard, with almost all, as merely *adversative*, but would translate it, *similarly*;—an interchange with ὁμῶς, ὁμοίως which philologists[3] find elsewhere, and which occurs certainly 1 Cor. xiv. 7 in the New Testament, and *probably* Gal. iii. 15.[4] Münchmeyer regards this as intolerable—they believed not, *similarly*, many also believed—but he does not understand my meaning, that St John reckons this believing and not confessing as being likewise unbelief, a view which alone suits the whole connection. There may often be much more of that enforced and commencing πιστεύειν than we suppose (ch. vii. 48); but it avails not before God until it reveals itself in con-

[1] Richter's Hausbibel has a good practical remark upon the important ver. 41, which the αὐτοῦ refers to Jesus (αὐτόν ver. 42): "ver. 40 can be understood only when we fix our regard upon the majesty of Christ, the visible image of the invisible God. It is only when we thus see Christ in the spirit that we see the ground of faith and unbelief. In contrast with this light the darkness appears exceeding dark, and *faith alone can rightly condemn unbelief*"—we would interline here, These things saith *John* also after Esaias, who seeth His glory and (in this Gospel) speaketh of Him.

[2] Nicodemus and Joseph, who both confessed Him during and after His judgment, and others like them, are not here included.

[3] Wahl cites Schæfer ad Greg. Cor. p. 631.

[4] Winer's construction of both passages, § 65. 4, does not appear convincing.

Hosted by Google

fession. In ver. 43 the Evangelist does not simply coincide with the Lord's first word, ch. iii. 19, but his remark is an almost literal citation from ch. v. 44 (according to which, consequently, we must explain the genitives *ἀνθρώπων* and *θεοῦ*); and is thus a testimony in transition that it is his purpose now to *refer back summarily to all the previous discourses of Jesus.*

Thus alone do we understand the following *ἔκραξε καὶ εἶπεν.* But though we concede this to the later expositors, it should not therefore be alleged against us that our arguments elsewhere, against such an introduction of the Evangelist's own hand, have no force. This case is very different from that of ch. iii. 16. In that chapter everything testifies for the Lord's immediate utterance of the words; but here St John gives us indubitable tokens that he himself is recapitulating. The older expositors, who down to the time of Michaelis and Morus lost sight of this, show us by this example how little their laborious exegesis penetrated the profound and real connection. Lampe makes the Lord utter vers. 44–50 *in ipso discessu*, quasi protestatione solenni factâ; Bengel thinks the same, and says that the *ἐκρύβη* was anticipated by St John as appropriate to *ἔτι μικρὸν χρόνον*, ver. 35. But this seems to us a forced supposition, after *ταῦτα ἐλάλησεν* and *ἀπελθών*, and such a resumption of His discourse, after a long intermediate reflection of the Evangelist's, is quite untenable. Hess thinks the discourse was uttered "soon afterwards, probably on the Thursday," while Ebrard (here at one with Strauss) seems confident that the Lord had so spoken on an *earlier* occasion; but the one, as well as the other, is glaringly out of harmony with the whole cast of the record as given by St John. Kling defends the old hypothesis, and so does Luthardt, most unconditionally. We agree, indeed, with Kling especially, that ver. 36 does not imply the future perfect silence of Jesus; but he is obliged to note it as singular that St John does not give after his manner the circumstances and occasion of this *κράζειν* in ver. 44. *Singular* enough, most assuredly! Besides this, how strange that this supposed discourse of Jesus should, to an extent of which there is no previous example, consist of *repetitions* alone, and, moreover, of only such words as are already found in St John's Gospel. Did the Lord ever *recapitulate* in this style, uttering connectedly so long a discourse with-

Hosted by Google

out any new thoughts and distinctive sayings? Much as we contend against others for repetitions in His discourses on other occasions, here we most decidedly deny it. But, conversely, here where for once St John recapitulates, seeming (though only seeming) to put his words into the Lord's lips, what an instructive example he gives us, not venturing to add (single turns of expression not reckoned) anything of his own. Yea, verily, all this the Lord *had said*, each saying in its season; but St John unites them all retrospectively together. And in this we agree with J. D. Michaelis, Morus, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Tholuck, Lücke, Meyer, B.-Crusius, Fikenscher, v. Gerlach, and Richter.[1] Lange, too, thinks rightly that the Evangelist here embraces the discourses of our Lord in significant sayings, according to his living remembrance; and Alford agrees with the later expositors. The aorists ἔκραξε καὶ εἶπεν are not, however, mere pluperfects. That would be very harsh:—Thus had He ever cried and testified that He demanded only faith in (their) God in His person; thus had He never ceased His endeavour to convince their minds and even their faith. But their signification is that of *wont*, that of a customary and abiding course of repeated action, parallel with ὡμολόγουν and ἠγάπησεν before, as Lücke rightly says. B.-Crusius well says, "He continuously thus uttered His loud declaration"—we may interline again, As the reader of this Gospel will remember. Brückner further remarks, with critical truth, "by the δέ, the loud declarations of Jesus, the substance of which were now to be given, are

[1] This last adds: "It is not *impossible* that Christ should have delivered this compendium of His last (*last?*) discourses, now at His final (*final?*) departure from the temple—as a concluding protest." It may not be impossible, but it seems in the highest degree improbable, to us, at least, inconceivable, and of itself unsanctioned by any hint in St John. Luthardt has advanced nothing new or convincing against our reasons, for the "deep significance of the unbelief of the Jews" cannot be regarded as the overlooked new element of this direct discourse of Jesus;—He had often already spoken on that point. It is *possible*, of course, that Jesus might have now *before His disciples* given a final declaration as to the consequences of the people's unbelief. As to this, we must, with Besser's Polemik, leave every man to his own feeling. But we most confidently protest against the idea of our Lord's recapitulation. Braune, it may be added, is constrained to decide for an apostrophe of Jesus in the hearing of His disciples.

Hosted by Google

placed in *opposition* to the unconfessing faith of the ἄρχοντες, ver. 42, 43"—a remark which of itself appears to us to be decisive.

But we cannot admit that these are "only isolated sentences without any strict internal connection." St John has a plain connection of his own; even as every preacher might now condense for himself extracts into an important whole, and perhaps should do so sometimes instead of his own incessant preaching and expounding. The comprehensive ground-thought is—The guilt of unbelief rests solely with Israel. Thus it is the same which the Lord Himself afterwards says in ch. xv. 22, or even in Matt. xxiii. 37. The *ground* and cause of this is placed first, vers. 44–46: He that believeth in Me doth no more than believe in the Father that sent Me, *for* he that seeth Me seeth Him—Thus am I come as *light!* (Correlative to *life*, ver. 50, according to the prologue; although this light hath *blinded* their eyes!) Then, in vers. 47, 48, the *consequence* of their self-condemnation is deduced from this; and in vers. 49, 50, this is again carried back to the previously stated ground, and it remains—I have spoken and speak what the Father hath given Me for the everlasting life of all who believe.

After this, there remains but little to be said upon the individual sayings, save to refer to the citations; though much is to be learned from the living and free manner in which previous sayings are here reproduced and combined in a new concert of their fundamental thoughts. The greater is the measure of the Spirit in the disciples of Jesus,—of *that* Spirit, namely, who does not teach the Teacher (as an Ishmaelite pseudo-Paraclete overpowering the Christ), but takes of His fulness,—the greater will be the *freedom* from the letter in the acceptation and reproduction of His words. Hence the fourth Evangelist as "initiatissimus mente Christi" is somewhat otherwise "tenacissimus verborum" than the three preceding; hence in the ancient church, and in all ages, the unliteral citation which we find in the writings and words of some saints. But this has its rigorous limitation; and is to be carefully fenced against perversion by the strictest literality in other cases, which expressly require it. Thus St John gives us here, just at the point between the public and the confidential discourses of Jesus, the explanation

Hosted by Google

of the manner in which he has apprehended and narrated His discourses. We find all that he here includes under the ἔκραξε καὶ εἶπεν, more or less literally in former discourses; but where the unliteralness *almost* passes over into a new construction of thought and language—no more than this can be said—we may assume that the Lord had actually so spoken, although His words had not been previously recorded.

Ver. 44. Compare ch. v. 24–38, πιστεύειν τῷ πέμψαντι being here elevated into πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν πέμψαντα; for the fundamental thought we may add ch. vii. 16, viii. 42. *Not on Me*—this first denies the so-called mere human personality of Christ, the *self* separated or distinguished from God in any sense; and then it intimates, further, that faith assuredly comes or passes on through Him to God, through the Son to the Father, as the apostolical doctrine teaches us, *e.g.*, 1 Pet. i. 21; Heb. vii. 25.

Ver. 45. In the literal expression this comes *afterwards*, ch. xiv. 9; but in this report of public words θεωρῶν is somewhat more general than the strict ἑωρακώς of that passage, and in the sense of ch. vi. 40 is parallel with πιστεύων. In the former discourses, ch. viii. 19 most closely corresponds with a combination of ch. x. 30, 38. But the words are not to be rationalistically qualified away, with Hess in his paraphrase: "he who more closely contemplates Me, will learn in Me to acknowledge the Father." Rather should it be understood in the sense of the previous words of St John, that Isaiah in the revelation of Jehovah saw the glory of Christ.

Ver. 46. This connects itself immediately with ver. 35 of this same chapter, and is a new argument—for assuredly the Lord did not repeat the very same words in the same sense so soon. But it still more closely corresponds with ch. viii. 12 and ix. 5, the ἐλήλυθα being taken from ch. iii. 19. The only peculiarity in the construction is μείνῃ, which simply gives expression to the thought which was self-understood in all the former utterances of the same truth, that before and independently of our faith in Him we are all naturally in darkness.

Ver. 47. See ch. iii. 17, v. 45, viii. 15. The new construction of the expression seems here more considerable, but it is only through the combination of various sayings for this place. The

Hosted by Google

hearing and nevertheless not believing corresponds precisely to the prophecy of ver. 40; comp. Matt. xiii. 13, *βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσι καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν*. The old misapprehension, that there is here a promise of *οὐ κρίνεσθαι ἀλλὰ σώζεσθαι* for all who truly hear, before the condemnation of the *ἀθετεῖν*, ver. 48, follows, was occasioned by the false omission of the *μή*. Equally false, even with *μή*, is the reading *φυλάξῃ*, which Grotius, Griesbach, Schott, and Lachmann approve; although the Vulgate has custodierit,[1] and the Peshito renders וְלֹא נָטַר. For believing, or rather *not believing*, is the main idea here; but the *φυλάσσειν* would too obscurely express this, and would refer rather to the stedfast continuance in faith, whereas the previous sentences all point to the one idea of the first and great separation of unbelief.

Ver. 48. See further ch. iii. 18. The construction of an almost new thought in this summary is here most conspicuous; and we might be inclined to assume a literal reference to some unrecorded word, though without that it would still be an actual *utterance of Jesus* through His Spirit in St John. The church may always regard it as such, even as I should in preaching upon it; for it is Jesus Himself who is speaking in this summary recapitulation of His discourses by the Evangelist.[2] The *μὴ λαμβάνειν* suggests ch. iii. 11, and *ἀθετεῖν* the synoptical expression Luke x. 16. It is not merely a despising, but a scornful and utter rejection instead of the *λαμβάνειν*. That the spoken word itself (with a strong, as it were personal and living *ἐκεῖνος*) will be the Judge, is a bold and true expression, since it is not an empty word, it can never be spoken in vain. On the one hand, it abides as a judge (Heb. iv. 12) in the memory and conscience till the last day (*ἔχει*); and, on the other, it will on that day, though only for condemnation, be reproduced in the mouth of the rejected Saviour, then the Judge. *Λόγος* is, of course, not an isolated word; but the sum and substance of all the *ῥήματα* which they had heard.

Ver. 49. Here again, as the convincing conclusion approaches,

[1] But Erasmus, crediderit.

[2] Besser admits this without hesitation; and his dealing with me is altogether more prudent, and therefore more friendly, than the usual manner of the Luther. Zeitschrift.

Hosted by Google

the reference to past utterances is most plain. *This* was said by the Lord many times; we mention only ch. v. 30, vii. 16, 17, 28, 29, viii. 26, 28, 38, 55, comp. ch. v. 19, and afterwards to the disciples ch. xiv. 10. The peculiarity of the verse lies partly in ἐντολὴν ἔδωκε, on which we have spoken, ch. viii. 55; partly in the all-embracing and emphatic τί εἴπω καὶ τί λαλήσω. These synonymous words have been laboriously distinguished in various ways. Rupert supposes that λαλήσω stands in opposition as a future,—and what I at *the last day* shall speak as Judge. But this will not apply to this summary of the rejected words of Jesus which God had put into His mouth (Deut. xviii. 18, 19), as vers. 48 and 50 show; and the ἐντολή is suitable to a state of humiliation alone. Lampe, similarly, would make the difference one of time—what I have hitherto said, and what I should now say, *is the conclusion of all;* but this of course falls with the assumption that Jesus Himself is still speaking. Ambrose thought of the distinction between private speaking and public teaching;[1] but the public testimony alone is here concerned. More consistent with the verbal synonymy is that which Theophylact advanced, who would distinguish the substance of what was said from the form of the expression (comp. πῶς ἢ τί Luke xii. 11): but in that case τί καὶ πῶς should be found instead of the redoubted τί. After the analogy of the Heb. אֲמַר and דְּבַר some have thought of the *præcepta*, or *promissa* as Lampe quotes from Gerhard. B.-Crusius would explain it as the *general* and the *particular*, but this is altogether without foundation. Fikenscher's view is very significant: "The *saying* refers to the hearers who hear the sayings of another; the *speaking* refers to the teacher who proclaims the truth. Jesus had fulfilled His vocation, as well in reference to men, who should find the way of truth, as *in reference to Himself as divinely commissioned* to declare the final revelation of God." In fact, if there must be a distinction, this one would most aptly suit the connection;—What I should *say to you* for salvation and what I should *speak* as the truth of God. But the uncertainty and variety of these distinctions are sufficient to induce us to decline them altogether, and rather to understand the emphasis of the twofold expression

[1] As Nonnus similarly expresses a softer and a louder speaking: ἀνδράσιν ἀγρομένοις τί φθέγξομαι ἢ τὶ βοήσω.

Hosted by Google

as Brandt does:—"Jesus declares His words to be *without distinction*, thus forbidding us to make distinction, the words of His Father, words which were *all of them* given Him of God." Thus the τί καὶ τί is equivalent to ὅσα ἄν, embracing every one of them, whether His words be termed εἰπεῖν or λαλεῖν.

Ver. 50. For the οἶδα comp. especially chap. iii. 11, v. 32, viii. 55; and for life everlasting chap. iii. 15, v. 24, vi. 40. Ἐντολή does not stand here for the word itself given to Him and then declared, nor must the ἐστί be flatly solved in the manner of Glassius—causa vel organon, per quod obtinetur vita æterna. Still less is ἐντολή to be taken in the legal sense; but it is just as in ver. 49 the *commission* received from God, to which as the Son of man He must ever remain faithful, comp. chap. x. 18—here, however, it is the commission what He should speak and testify. This commission *is*, in its ground and aim, according to its design and indwelling power, no other than life everlasting for all who believe. It is the *will* of God that all who receive the Son should receive and preserve life. Chap. vi. 39, 40. *This* embraces the true concluding idea of the entire recapitulation:—Jesus had thus faithfully spoken, that all according to the Father's will and His own might be saved if they would.

THE WASHING OF THE FEET, AND ITS SIGNIFICATION.

(Chap. xiii. 7–20.)

Before we enter upon the subject itself, and consider the words in which Jesus explains His own action, we must determine the period of its occurrence: for, the action derives its special significance from its time, as the Evangelist gives us plainly to understand; and, moreover, a much-contested difficulty upon this point demands our attention. We would not expose ourselves to the censure of evading these difficulties; but we will be all the more brief, because the question has been already treated with such superabundant prolixity, that the independent investigator has at command everything that enters into its solution.

The commencing words πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα occasion

Hosted by Google

but very slight obscurity, as Lücke admits:—"this definition of the time does not require us to regard John as deviating from the Synoptical chronology." The same Evangelist who in chap. xii. 1 has reckoned the days, would have expressly said "one day before," if that had been his meaning. So that we can hardly understand the ἑορτή, after Joseph. Archæol. 3, 10, 5, as referring to the more restricted ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων which followed the day of the paschal sacrifice; the phraseology of Luke xxii. 7, Matt. xxvi. 17 is itself decisive against that.[1] Thus πρό simply signifies a short time previously, immediately before; and indicates the δεῖπνον to be the paschal meal and the beginning of the feast itself, the προεόρτιον. (Why ver. 29 should render this improbable to de Wette we cannot perceive.) The statement manifestly becomes thus more and more definite, and reaches its highest point of precision in the δείπνου γενομένου, the true meaning of which we shall afterwards discuss. Lange correctly remarks that πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς is closely connected with ἐγείρεται, ver. 4: but such a specific action as the rising from a seat is not reckoned by days but by hours and minutes; and consequently it is here—a few moments before the beginning of the feast He rose up. Thus this supper, at which the washing of the feet took place, is by no means an ordinary "supper" (as the absence of the article, quite natural in such a phrase, has been urged), quite distinct from the Synoptic paschal meal, the previous Wednesday, or, as has been said, in Bethany.[2] For, St John's narrative carries everything on in strict connection from this point down to chap. xiv. 31, and xviii. 1, so that *this* δεῖπνον is followed by the going forth to Gethsemane. The Hirschberg Bible has remarked that if the indication of the betrayal, given here vers. 21–30, had taken place already one or two days before, the amazement of the disciples when the Lord uttered the same at the paschal feast, as narrated by the Synoptics, would be inexplicable.[3] Further, the parallel Luke xxii. 27 (as observed by

[1] The reference of this intimation of time to εἰδώς simply (Jesus already knew before the passover—!) has been defended recently by Baumlein and Luthardt; but we must reject it still, for St John always, when defining the day, refers to the event which follows.

[2] The Pers. trans.—two days before the feast.

[3] Richter's Hausbibel (to put an end to all confusion, which will not be the result, however, of this notion!) adopts this opinion of many, including

Hosted by Google

Olshausen) evidently shows that our Lord at the paschal meal washed the feet *as a servant*—for those words are His own reference to the act. And this was obviously not only before the institution of the Lord's Supper (which we must thus interpose at its right place in St John), but also before *the proper supper*. For we cannot conceive that the contention related by St Luke took place *after* the washing of the feet and the Sacrament.[1] Nor was (according to Lücke) "the supper *interrupted* by the feet-washing, which was so foreign to the prescribed paschal ritual, that we can find no place for it in the paschal meal." For the ἐκ in ἐκ τοῦ δείπνου, ver. 4, is groundlessly urged (since Gerhard) as signifying the completion of the meal, because among the Greeks ἐκ δείπνου, ἐξ ἀρίστου so occurs; δείπνου γενομένου, ver. 2 (for which there is a single false reading γινομένου) is certainly to be translated, according to Meyer's correction of Luther—when the supper arrived, was ready, about to proceed, comp. chap. xxi. 4. This brief expression, unaccompanied by any record of any δεῖπνον, and what kind, appointed, assures us (without the article which Brückner insisted upon) that a reference must be presupposed to the well-known last meal of our Lord πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς, that is, ἐν τῷ προεορτίῳ, in the transition between the evenings. The Vulg. (followed, of course, by Klee and Friedlieb) is altogether wrong in its cænâ factâ; for it is this striking action of our Lord, which St John records, that when they were already seated and about to begin, He *rises* again ἐκ τοῦ δείπνου, and afterwards, in ver. 12, sat down again to the proper meal (vers. 23–26).[2]

Thus it is preliminarily certain, and very generally now acknowledged, that this meal of St John is the paschal meal of the Synoptics, and that the feet-washing took place before the

Bengel; but it finds little acceptance now, and the view of the latter is highly forced that St John hastens over a whole day between vers. 30 and 31.

[1] On the other hand, we must not assume, with Ebrard, that the contest arose because no one would undertake the service of washing the feet! The φιλονεικία either referred to their places, or sprang, generally, as at other times, from their carnal notions of the kingdom, if not specifically from the words just spoken concerning it. (See afterwards our exposition in vol. vi.)

[2] It may be proved that the passover was not then eaten standing; and in any case, they had not yet reached that point.

Hosted by Google

institution of the Supper. But how is it that, according to the Synoptics, Jesus then ate the paschal lamb; while, according to John xviii. 28 and xix. 14, the Friday of His death was the day on which the Jews *made ready to eat the passover?* This question, which in the most ancient time was regarded by no one as a real contradiction, and was never mentioned in the Easter controversy, has assumed a very threatening aspect in our latest criticism. The ancient assumption, which began with Chrysostom and Tertullian, that the Lord partook of His passover *one day earlier* than the people and the Pharisees (on grounds differently viewed, and either alone or with a part of the Jews), is now unhesitatingly rejected; and they either solve the difficulty by some other artificial means, or leave the Synoptics under the imputation of a *hopeless difference*, or *manifest error*.

Among the artificial methods of extrication which are untenable I include the attempted explanations which have been given to the two opposing passages, John xviii. 28 and xix. 14; although Wieseler and others defend them. The formula *φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα* must have, in my judgment, the same meaning in the fourth Evangelist which it has in the other three; it is most harsh to refer it in the former only to the subsequent passover eating, the *ἄζυμα* or even the חֲגִיגָה. In this we concur with Lücke and Ebrard, that "it must be ever incomprehensible wherefore St John should have used so altogether uncommon an expression: (comp. Joseph. Ant. III. x. 5, where the *ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων* is strictly distinguished from the *ἑορτὴ τοῦ πάσχα*, similarly II. xv. 1; XI. iv. 8, etc.). It is true that in Deut. xvi. 2, as צֹאן וּבָקָר shows, "the remaining legal offerings and meats of the whole feast" are included under the collective name פֶּסַח. But we cannot (like Hofmann, Weiss. u. Erf. ii. 201) appeal to this passage; for we discover again from another passage, 2 Chron. xxxv. 7, 8, 9 (cited by Wieseler himself) that, properly speaking, only the כְּבָשִׂים וּבְנֵי עִזִּים are mentioned as פְּסָחִים or paschal victims; and, moreover, the collective name, as *including* this essential פֶּסַח, is a very different thing from the collective name, as given to the feast, *exclusive* of and *after* the essential meal. In the *ἵνα φάγωσι*, coupled with *τὸ πάσχα* having the article, it is incontrovertibly meant that they had eaten

Hosted by Google

hitherto in no sense of the word Passover.[1] Finally, 2 Chron. xxx. 22 has וַיֹּאכְלוּ אֶת־הַמּוֹעֵד so expressly, that we see how impossible it would have been to substitute there הַפֶּסַח. With *φαγεῖν*, and this is the main point, *τὸ πάσχα* necessarily retains the restricted sense; as the passages in the Synoptics declare the usage in the time of Jesus. Consequently, the *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα* cannot signify the Friday in the paschal feast—as we must grant to the opposite side, after all that Wieseler has adduced; but it is no other than the Jewish עֶרֶב הַפֶּסַח[2] (although Luthardt opposes this). For we must certainly take *both* the passages of St John together, for the special meaning of the *τὸ πάσχα*. When this Evangelist in ch. xix. 14 calls the same day *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα*, concerning which he had previously said, ch. xviii. 28, *ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα*, he certainly uses the expression in the same meaning, and *παρασκευὴ* here is not the (in this place meaningless) statement of the day of the week, but corresponds precisely to the *ἵνα φάγωσι*. The passages, Matt. xxvii. 62; Mar. xv. 42; Lu. xxiii. 54, are only an apparent parallel; for St John thinks first of the approaching *Sabbath*, this time a great Sabbath as coinciding with the first feast-day, afterwards in ver. 31, and thus intimates that it was a *παρασκευὴ* in a twofold sense.

Rauch has endeavoured to convince us that the proper passover, in contradistinction from the *ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων* had already been eaten between the *thirteenth* and fourteenth of Nisan; but this marvellous hypothesis (as Winer calls it), which requires others to uphold it, has never found acceptance, and has been satisfactorily refuted by Lücke, de Wette, Ebrard, and Wieseler. Schneckenburg's attempt, which disturbs all the previous chronology, needs no mention. Are we then led to the conclusion (with Schleiermacher, Lücke, and many others, that the difference is irreconcilable, and the *error* on the side of the Synoptics? Most certainly not! According to Lücke the error sprang from

[1] Bengel's paraphrase was highly arbitrary: "to continue uninterrupted the remaining eating of the passover!" From the feet-washing and the sacrament onwards is the weakest point in Bengel's harmony.

[2] Comp. in addition the passage adduced by Friedlieb (Archäol. d. Leidengesch. S. 129) from the Babyl. Gemara, which contains a tradition that Jesus was hanged on the tree בערב הפסח.

Hosted by Google

a very early misunderstanding of uncertain traditions, so that the tradition made itself complete by suppositions originating in itself. "*Indeed*"—he says himself, but one would almost think ironically—"if the relation of Matthew springs immediately from the Apostle, *this method of explanation is untenable.*" But we must not let this one passover-stroke take away Matthew from us! Hauff admits "the supposition that the Synoptics adjusted the time of the death of Jesus with the festivals which had been held from the beginning by the Jewish-Christian communities to commemorate these events"—but if we substitute the *Apostle Matthew* for "Synoptics," all such notions must be rejected at once. Nor can we accept of any original "tradition" that "through want of chronological interest in a circumstance which involved questions of so much greater moment, independent of chronology, precision was not at first thought necessary, and the question of dates remained ever after undetermined." For the *chronological* question in *this case* has direct reference to what was of the *highest possible moment* to the first Christians, viz., the connection between the Old Testament and the New, the coincidence of type and fulfilment—for which the time of celebrating Easter formed the firm historical kernel and centre.[1] So that we may be sure that the first Gospel for Israel with its ἵνα πληρωθῇ, and the Apostle Matthew its assured author, would not have erred through indifference upon this point. Tholuck says, "The nature of the holy sacrament, its internal analogy with the Passover, makes it probable in itself that it originated in strict relation with the Passover. We cannot bring ourselves to assume in the Synoptics a failure in remembrance upon so significant an event, the sensible allusions of which were so peculiar and characteristic." B.-Crusius, whom no dogmatic motive influences, thinks any actual difference in the historical record "improbable in relation to a matter so important to the community as was this last meal." Yes, indeed, improbable even to impossibility. We should have to assume (to use the words of a critic against Bleek), "that the Synoptics not only were quite ignorant of the day on which Jesus Christ

[1] Thus there is no ground for Hase's remark, that "the *error* of the Galilæan tradition rose from *taking it for granted* that the Lord's Supper must have been instituted in connection with the Paschal meal."

Hosted by Google

was put to death, but that their record of it is in flagrant opposition to the most sacred Jewish statutes against executions during the feast!"

For our own part, then, we return, after a thorough examination of all new theories, to the old explanation which has been already mentioned. St John and the Synoptics are alike right. Jesus, with His disciples, ate the Passover on Thursday, when He instituted the supper; the Jews in general ate it on the Friday of His death. So far Ebrard is clear, but he has a new answer to the question how this is to be accounted for: "the eating of the passover proceeded through two days, because it was impossible that the slaying for so enormous a number could be effected in the three evening hours of one single day, and thus the law was of necessity violated; the day was anticipated, the previous day being included in the celebration, and this would be especially the case with the Galilæans and the poorer class." However well-meant and plausible this may be, we altogether reject it, with Wieseler.[1] What other account can we give? The criticism which reconciles scientific investigation with faith in the historical truth of all the Evangelists, including St Matthew, can only decide that Jesus in fact ate the meal one day earlier than the mass or the majority of the people, and that this must have had a specific reason, which can be supplied by supposition alone. Lücke's assertion that "it is impossible to extract from the synoptical text even the semblance of an anticipation of the Passover"—is true, *as far as* this anticipation is an arbitrary act of Jesus Himself; but if any other reason can be assigned, this peremptory verdict must fall. We must not resort to the old refuge of a *πάσχα μνημονικὸν, μνημονευτικὸν* in the case of our Lord; that was something quite different, originating after the destruction of the temple, and the Synoptics speak of the proper Jewish passover. Nor did the Lord, scrupulously obedient to all the Divine commandments (if not to all the appended statutes of men), by His own specific plenitude of authority anticipate the day on account

[1] S. 347 in the note, where also the error concerning the priests' slaying is exposed. We think that the people would rather have built another Jerusalem than have allowed such a departure from the legal day on account of external circumstances.

Hosted by Google

of the Supper (as Hippolytus assumed), and, besides, St Luke, ch. xxii. 7 speaks of the *ἡμέρα, ἐν ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα.*[1] What then are we to suppose? That which in itself is not unimaginable, that in the computation of that time, as in many other things, an interruption or derangement had crept in among the Jews. Although *ὅτε ἔθυον* stands in Mar. xiv. 12, yet we do not see why, in connection with *οἱ μαθηταί*, the whole people must necessarily be the subject of this *ἔθυον*; but are disposed to find in St Luke's *ἔδει*, in spite of the protest of recent critics, the hint of anticipation which has been found wanting, a tacit opposition to the prevalent practice of others. So that Jesus, in common with a portion of the Jews, *properly* and *legally* held sacred the *contested day*, which the predominant party had displaced in favour of the following.

An analogous example of a slighter difference is furnished by the controversy over the בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם, Ex. xii. 6. The Karaites and Samaritans understood the time *after* the going down of the sun till entire darkness, the Pharisees and Rabbanites explained it of the decline of the day *before* sundown (רוּחַ הַיּוֹם) as the first evening; the latter in the time of Josephus was the prevalent theory and practice. The former, notwithstanding, was the correct view (concurred in by Abenezra), as Winer almost unnecessarily proves, and Michaelis before him, Suppl. ad lex. s. v. עֶרֶב, comparing the Arabic usage.[2] If this controversy, whether *before* or *after* sun-down was the limit of the day, had been connected also with a diverse *date*, occasion might have been in some sense given for moving the day onward, and thus introducing a division in the Kalendar. But *this* was not the case, else would the priority of the Pharisaic passover have resulted, according to Josephus. We mention this analogy only for the purpose of asking,—Why might not

[1] Which *ἔδει* we thus more definitely justify than Weitzel does in his excellent treatise upon the Passover festival. We cannot bring ourselves to understand, with him, "an Old Testament meal made earlier *by necessity*" (analogous with the deferring it in Num. ix. 11).

[2] Convincing reasons are—The analogy of Ex. xxix. 39, the בֵּבוֹא הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ, Deut. xvi. 6, the whole history of the exodus immediately after the passover.

Hosted by Google

the reckoning of the day, through some possible circumstance of which we have no record, have become subject to such a diversity as appears in the Gospels? For as τὸ πάσχα was assuredly not eaten twice, *our sources* say plainly this and no more, that some ate it on one day, and others on the next. And can we not bring our minds to attach at least the same authority to the plain letter of *Scripture* as to that of Josephus or the Talmud? It cannot indeed be *proved* (scilicet, from other sources), nor can it be demanded without disparagement to the γραφή, that such a diversity of practice existed in the time of Jesus; but it is historically imaginable. We have ground enough for this without resorting to the various reckoning of the new moon at a much later time (according to Capellus, Iken, etc.). Suffice it that we may ask, Who can prove it to be impossible that the difference, *which is historically as certain as the authority of at least two Apostles can make it*, should have some such reason? Then should we escape from the hypothesis, which, however slightly regarded, is objectionable, that Jesus was crucified on the great feast day;[1] and with that, much sophistical perversion of St John's expressions. Then Jesus fulfilled (as Scaliger, Casaubon, Marck, etc. assumed) the law exactly, while its observation among the people had fallen into disorder. And then our typological view finds a yet *deeper significance* in the whole arrangement of these events according to the profound counsel of God.

It was impossible, that is, that our Lord's last eating the paschal lamb, as the end of His obedience under the law, should be perfectly simultaneous with His own offering of Himself; an absolute coincidence of type and reality could not be. Yet should this coincidence be as close as possible, especially, at least, where the correspondency was most important, in the connection between the Supper and the paschal lamb. Hence it was provided (as Lampe says, whose *anticipabat*, however, we do not agree with—occulto Dei consilio) that the occurrences should take place just as we find them. Now this was deeply significant in two ways. On the same day on which the majority representing the people, the Pharisaic part, ate their

[1] Compare, in addition, Tholuck's liter. Anzeiger 1847. S. 200, ff.

Hosted by Google

passover, the Lord is crucified.[1] But they crucify Him first, and then go to eat their passover at the illegally deferred time, and rendered unclean by the blood of the Son of God! That signifies most clearly, The type is now *done away!*[2] But the Lord on His part *glorifies* for His new Israel the *abiding* type by the institution of the Sacrament in connection with His *legally proper* passover; so that *our* sacramental institution took place most harmoniously as an *anticipation* of the great event, just as the first passover of Moses was an anticipation of the exodus, of the actual passing over and redemption.

In addition to the note of time St John gives us here a preparatory remark, which announces with dignity a new scene, predicting in sublime words a sublime event. The public life and teaching of the Lord has reached its close. The hour is come, which had from the beginning been indicated as nearer and nearer. The history of the Passion begins. But with demonstrations and new exhibitions of love to *His own* before He departed from them. And by this expression the Evangelist tells us that the esoteric portion of the Gospel, its most essential mystery, is about to follow: awakening in every feeling heart a deep desire —after all the previous warfare of unbelief against the truth, after all the fruitless striving of the Son of God and the Son of man to win these children of Abraham and sons of Adam to Himself and eternal life, after all this vain pouring forth of His precious ointment, of His wooing bridegroom-love (Cant. i. 3; Jno. iii. 29)—to taste at last and see how *gracious* He is to those who have been made His own, how He comforts and solaces His own heart with them, and imparts in all its fulness to them that which others have despised. If the history of the Passion is

[1] Olshausen: "The typical character of the Passover (1Cor. v. 7), makes the assumption probable, that the Lord died on the same day on which the paschal lamb should have been killed." We would only say instead—*was* killed. This coincidence in general our Lord indicates in Matt. xxvi. 2, as God's counsel. Comp. Thiersch, die Kirche in apost. Zeitalter i. 295.

[2] Exspiraverat jam Paschatis umbratilis terminus, postquam Jesus rite ultimum comederat. Lampe.

Hosted by Google

generally the Holy of Holies in the new covenant—St John, we would fain say, opens to us the very ark of the covenant in the heart of the incarnate Saviour. Happy thou, dear reader, if the voice of the Spirit *now* crieth to thy spirit—*Come and see!* Dignus es intrare—thou also belongest to those who are *His own!*

St John saw into the heart of Jesus; and he therefore writes vers. 1 and 3 as it were out of that heart, as if Jesus had *told* him what he reveals to us by a twice-repeated εἰδώς. The words stream forth, indeed, down to ver. 5 in one continuous flow, ver. 1 is not complete in itself but announces something more; nevertheless, we do well to construe (according to the old and universal view, which Lücke so well justifies) the first verse as standing by itself, so that its emphasis may fall upon the *loving*. The knowing that His hour was come obviously connects this new continuation of the Gospel with the previous chapter, indeed with all that had preceded as far back as ch. ii. 4.[1] Out of *this world*—is, with allusion to ch. xii. 31, a sorrowful retrospect upon the past contradiction of sinners in it. He goes away, leaves this world as all in death; but He alone goeth *to the Father* by a wonderful μεταβαίνειν. He has ἰδίους in this world to leave behind (ch. xvii. 11), whom He Himself has first chosen and obtained through His own love, as certainly as the Father had given them unto Him. These *He had loved* from the beginning, yea, from eternity, before He came forth from the Father for their sakes; He has shown all patience and fidelity towards their infirmity and sinfulness, He has endured all for them and with them, He has borne even until now *their* unbelief for the sake of the kindled spark of faith and love within them. And what love had been already shown even in this! But now He loveth them εἰς τέλος. This is not, with Grotius, to be resolved into—διετέλει ἀγαπῶν, perrexit diligere; nor with Euthymius, τὸ εἰς τέλος τὸ σφόδρα δηλοῖ; nor to be taken as a mere לָנֶצַח (according to the Sept. translation of this, and as the Pesh. Lu. xviii. 5 has בְּכֹל עִדָּן); but τέλος is literally His end and departure,

[1] It would be a profitable, and far from exhausted, task, to exhibit the simple art of the plan of this Gospel, as shown in the circumstance that the beginning everywhere prepares for the end, and the end returns back in its fulfilment to the intimations of the beginning.

Hosted by Google

which now from this meal onwards so long and slowly protracts itself in proofs and tokens of love. Laus in amore mori—a heathen maxim which finds here its highest illustration.[1]

Ver. 2 begins again with an intenser εἰδώς, which now, in contrast with the action which is to commence, becomes equivalent to καίπερ εἰδώς. But another impressive parenthesis intervenes, another καίπερ from an external cause. Even among *His own*, and at this meal, is the traitor found, into whose heart the devil has been able to infuse thoughts of hell! The ἤδη intimates that the design of this parenthesis is further to say, that the destiny of our Lord, to be now delivered into the hands of His enemies, was fully decided and at hand:—yet this is not its only meaning. The Berlenb. Bible comments upon it with deep feeling in its own way: "Something now comes between! The devil has not kept holiday, and the Evangelists always place God's work and Satan's in conjunction, as they are developed together. On both sides preparation is made for the contest: Christ prepares Himself, Satan prepares himself too. Hence the text appears here abruptly torn asunder—yet there is a deep harmony and connection in the matter itself. The style is thus intersected, to show that Christ has such a tangled way to pierce through, and that His disciples must in like manner follow Him." Thus it is not, as Hofmann thinks, a "verbally infelicitous connection of clauses."

Jesus *knew*—it is not now said, what was in the heart of Judas—that follows in ver. 11. Instead of that, without interruption He *knew* that to Him—*not* indeed all, but, nevertheless, even for judgment upon the υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπωλείας, *all things* were given into His hand; and that He was going to God, even *as* He came forth from God, that is, as the Son *to the Father*. Perfect repose, the untroubled consciousness of His might, victory, and glorification fills His spirit now, after His deep amazement. For *Him*, in the place of that *faith* from which in our case *love* springs, we have here *knowledge*. What would one who first read the Gospel *expect*, after such a preface, and after all the previous testimonies to the dignity and glory of this Jesus? The ἠγάπησεν has already given a hint; but no man could have expected what now follows. The first reader must stand amazed,

[1] Nitzsch has a beautiful sermon on "Love to the end."

Hosted by Google

even like these disciples when He began the work of love and humility. He who does not for ever lose his thoughts in the contemplation of the inconceivable contrast between vers. 3 and 4, is beyond the reach of all exegesis; the most touching exposition to him must be vain and dead. He, the Lord over all, come forth from God and returning to God, concerning whom the greatest of the prophets cried, I am not worthy to *begin* my service to Him by unloosing His shoe's latchet (ch. i. 27)—He goes beyond this; He washes the feet of His disciples, and Judas' among them. For He also knoweth *wherefore* He had come, and *to what end* He goeth again by death, that is, that He might *wash* us. This *they* knew not yet; but they knew it afterwards, and in addition to this most general signification of His act, there is another which has reference to this critical time, their preparation for the last supper. The second preparation comes after in the awakening of the question, *Lord is it I?* through the indication of the betrayer; but the first had already said, *I am He* that cleanseth you! It was not so much on account of their murmuring at the anointing, and their fellowship in sympathy with the traitor, that they now needed this specific cleansing: if any is sought, it may be found in the recent contention recorded by St Luke. But all was fore-arranged, that the Lord, out of the love of His full heart, might speak to them in act before He spoke to them in words, and thus prepare them to take the deepest impression from His words.

The *washing of the feet* was assuredly not simply the lowest *menial service*, but, according to common human analogy, was at the same time no other than a *service of honour and of love* which the host might render to his guests. Ebrard, however, presses this much too far when he declares this to have been the customary "duty of the host," so that "the Lord may be said in the deep significance of this act to have already invited His *guests* to *His* supper." For even Lu. vii. 44 does not say expressly that the washing was to be expected from the host, but is rather to be interpreted by Gen. xviii. 4; and in Lu. xxii. 27, the Lord expressly indicates the main point to be—ὡς ὁ διακονῶν.[1]

[1] We very much doubt whether (as Lange thinks) this feet-washing arose from the *necessity* of the moment, being a necessary service which none of the disciples volunteered to perform.

Hosted by Google

Unusual, and pointing to a striking significance, is the rising up from the meal already proceeding. The Evangelist paints the circumstance with a living remembrance of the amazement which seized at the time both him and the rest of the disciples:—hence the interchange of the present tense, and hence that most emphatic ἤρξατο, for which nothing that preceded had prepared them. Everything pertaining to the act He did Himself; down to the wiping He finishes all in the case of each of the disciples, in whom He beholds all *His own* down to the end of time. In solemn stillness and with the deepest reverence they first allow Him to proceed—until it comes to Peter. For that Peter was not the first,[1] is plain from the previous fifth verse, especially from the *wiping*—else we must resort to such an anticipation as is quite out of harmony with the living presentation of the whole narrative.[2] If supposition were allowable where the Holy Ghost records nothing—for all gradation of rank *here* passes away—it would be more probable that *Judas* was the first (as Chrys. and Theoph., with many following them, thought); though if *Peter* were the last, his refusal would be scarcely conceivable.[3]

That which probably others thought before him, he speaks out plainly, and without any restraint. His meaning is not wrong, but here once more it befalls him to savour not the things of God but the things of man. Through false and self-willed reverence and voluntary humility he sinks into opposition and refusal; for most assuredly *his* thought does not now apprehend the true Divine humility. The customary κύριε comes first as we see, but it has here a distinctive emphasis; but the intensest emphasis lies in the contrast which is pressed to the uttermost

[1] Although Nonnus takes this for granted; and since Augustin many have so thought. Bellarmin founds a strong argument upon it, and Klee maintains that every other disciple would have similarly declined. Baum.-Crusius: ἔρχεται, probably at the commencement! So Grotius, without any reason: οὖν hic est specialius rem enarrantis.

[2] Which Luthardt, however, agrees with, arguing that it was a preparatory description of the whole act which would render Peter's conduct intelligible! But what simple writer would relate in this style?

[3] Dräseke thinks, first John, then immediately Peter. Richter, though without any reason, Either first or last was the washing of Peter. Schleiermacher says with great discrimination, The ordinary pre-eminence of Peter was the reason why the Lord *this time* took occasion *not* to begin with him.

Hosted by Google

σύ—μοῦ! Not till these words have uttered his deep feeling does he finish the sentence, which, however, still strongly protests: by the present νίπτεις he rises up against the commencing action of the Lord Himself; τοὺς πόδας comes in last to heighten the whole; and the interrogation is not simply such but a most absolute refusal, although a slight but true feeling of genuine awe prevents him in his first words from doing more than *question*, until ver. 8 comes in with a different tone. Thus his present word is fundamentally the same with that affrighted utterance which responded to the approaching love of the Saviour in Lu. v. 8. This colloquy between him and his Lord is by no means, as B.-Crusius unfeelingly and foolishly says, "a trifling matter," nor is it a subordinate circumstance which St John might well have omitted; but Peter is here, if we would see the great meaning of the whole, a type of man generally, as he revolts against the eternal love which offers itself in the redeeming death of Christ. "For thy sake, O sinner, I have laid by the garment of My glory, have girded Myself with the napkin of the flesh, to pour out My blood as a cleansing bath for thee—*as thy God and thy Servant!*" But, alas, in man's refusal, This is unworthy of God, this *cannot be*—there too often lies the still worse undertone (from which Peter, however, according to ver. 9, was utterly free)—*Nor is this at all needful!*

Ver. 7. And now, but not until it is constrained from Him, comes the first *word* of our Lord after His silent act; but it contains the assurance that He had designed *afterwards* to speak and explain all. And He gives prominence to the contrasted ἐγώ and σύ, but in their right meaning, and with the true inference:—I am the Master, Thou the disciple—How shouldst thou then at once know, penetrate, and understand *what* I do, that is, what I thereby purpose and mean? Obedience without argument would be the profounder modesty. And the trusting disciple of such a Master, teaching as Jesus did both by act and word, might and ought to have *expected* that He would explain all in condescension to His disciple's weakness. The meek and gentle Lord, however, does not by the slightest word rebuke the impatience of Peter, who would not thus wait; the single οὐκ οἶδας ἄρτι was sufficient rebuke, and at the same time utters a

Hosted by Google

promise to supply that deficiency of knowledge which is thereby rather excused. The antithesis between ἄρτι and μετὰ ταῦτα shows that the most obvious meaning must be referred to the repelled washing:—As soon as I have done it unto all, thou shalt know with the rest what My act signifies. And truly, without the words which now accompany, and afterwards follow, the act, we should none of us understand the meaning of what He did; we might discern in it the *example* of humility, but scarcely the manifold mystery of the profound *symbol*. For wide and deep is this mystery; and therefore the Saviour begins the preliminary solution of it by a word which, as the commencement of that solution, has a universal import. *What I do*—first, this washing of your feet; then (as follows in ver. 8) the washing generally thereby denoted; finally, all His work in us, in as far as it centres in and belongs to this, that He washes us from sin. Who understood the work of His *atoning passion* when and while it was accomplished? And how wide does this μετὰ ταῦτα reach for His church and the world, in which the counsels of God in the humiliation of Christ are from age to age ever becoming more profoundly and fully disclosed! So also the last application of this word, that by which the Holy Ghost so often uses it for humbling our resistance and consoling our apprehensions, is perfectly well-grounded. It is in its widest extent an utterance concerning *all* the acts of God, which will never be fully understood till hereafter; the eternal Majesty speaks in this lowest abasement of the Son, and speaks with reference to all the future acts of His government from this present action onwards. It is enough for us that He shows us and gives us to feel no more than this—I do it; we may confidently resign ourselves to His hand. We shall hereafter know, that and in what way all was done for our purification; we shall in eternity look back upon the whole process of His guiding and cleansing our souls, and merge all in that cry—Thou hast washed us from our sins, and therefore didst Thou obediently abase Thyself to our feet!

Ver. 8. The first word was thus distinct and gentle, thus serenely victorious over the impetuosity of Peter; yet it is with this disciple as often with us all, his outbursting zeal renders him incapable of hearing, much more of understanding and

Hosted by Google

receiving the first words with which the Lord opposes him. They urge, rather, his opposition to a further extreme; he will maintain his right, accept no *οὐκ οἶδας*, and be referred to no *γνώσῃ μετὰ ταῦτα*. Though the other washed disciples had improperly allowed the Lord thus to act, he will show himself wiser and more humble than they, as if he knew even better than his Master what was befitting and right! The present *νίπτεις* and the tone of question betrayed before something tending to submission; but now he begins with an imperative *οὐ μὴ νίψῃς*, and confirms it with the deepest feeling by *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*. (Bengel: formula vehemens, cf. 1 Cor. viii. 13.) What other can the gracious Lord do now, than oppose vehemence to vehemence, and utter a second, decisive and heart-piercing word which should *affright* the contradicter, who nevertheless in the ground of his heart hangs upon Him and would be His? If I shall *wash* thee not, *thou hast no part with* (*or, in*) *Me!* Alas, such words of threatening and fear are too often necessary for us all, to induce us to permit ourselves to be loved. It is wrong to say, as many do with good intention but a narrow interpretation, that the threatening here is not to be sought in the word washing, or in the transaction connected with it; for this *νίπτειν* is the kernel and object of the whole. Thus it is not, "Unless thou bend to My ordinance, and give up thy disobedient independence of My will"—this would be too naked a generality! Nor, as Lücke says, "He who will not tolerate, or does not understand, the humility of love, as now exemplified in Me." Nor, as another says, approaching somewhat nearer, "Unless thou, by acceptance of this service, showest thyself to be willing to perform such!" Neither of these hits the point of significance; the latter passes beyond it into the *final* interpretation of ver. 14. He who *does not comprehend* the humble love with which Jesus washes him, understands it not simply because he does not know and consider *what* this *washing* essentially is. De Wette and Lücke quite falsely urge that the real gist of the matter is not the cleansing but the humility of love: this saying in ver. 8, and the general declaration of ver. 10, sufficiently refute them. The *washing* is not specifically a "purification from all petty loftiness of spirit"—as Dräseke says. Let us look at its deep fulness of meaning, as the Lord Himself exhi-

Hosted by Google

bits it under three aspects: the feet-washing signifies, first, that it is the Lord who *cleanses* us, He alone can and will wash us; it then points further to the continual necessity that those who have been cleansed in the bath should ever wash their *feet*, and that this likewise must come from His patience and love; while, thirdly, and resting upon these (though it is too often regarded as the sole point, the previous foundation being forgotten), that we also can and should be helpful *to one another* in all humble services which might contribute to that end.[1]

That the Lord on this occasion does not mean this external washing, but that which it signifies, is clear from the threatening itself, and from the fact that He washed Judas also, who nevertheless had no part in Him.[2] That, further, He did not now as yet speak particularly of a spiritual washing of the feet, the continuous cleansing from remaining or again adhering sins, is equally clear from this that He now—and let it be carefully noted!—does *not* speak of the *feet*, as Peter does twice, but extends the matter to its utmost generality, and penetrates its deepest ground—*I must wash thee!* This His utterance here is essentially similar, though with other words, to that of ch. vi. 53. And it is for emphasis and awakening that He does not say at first *from what* the washing is; for His single word would ask—Dost thou not then at all perceive and understand what is now concerned between Me and thee, Me the sole Helper and Purifier *from sin*, and thee the "sinful man!" Dost thou not remember the time when thou didst bid Me depart from thee? Hast thou not since learned in My school to what all things point *which I do?* If the former part of the sentence, with its simple and impressive "wash thee," was not penetrating enough,

[1] Hence, that view is most superficial, and forgets the *ground* here laid for the whole, which regards the Lord's design as being simply to deepen their humility and *take away all their previous ideas of a worldly kingdom.* Dräseke: "He will make a last essay. He would burn out of the hearts of His messengers the dross of earth still in them." Bahrdt, in the same direction: "Nothing cleaves to you but the prejudice of a temporal Messiah; it is merely a washing of feet that ye need. Your Lord now shows Himself a servant, that you may remember that ye are called to be servants of humanity, not Princes of the East!"

[2] Luthardt: "If thou dost not bethink thyself what My washing signifies."

Hosted by Google

the fearful sequel makes all plain—Then are we severed for ever! Yes, verily, this was a terrifying and awakening word, for it meant, Then dost thou remain *unwashed*, as thou art, impure, without forgiveness and without grace, without salvation and without a Saviour, unfit for and unworthy of My fellowship here, and hereafter of My kingdom and My glory. For to intimate this last the μετ' ἐμοῦ is used, although the ἐν ἐμοί is obviously included in it. *Or wilt thou wash thyself?*—At the same time the Lord gives it here to be understood—I wash no man against his will. And let this be deeply pondered!

The passionate desire to have a part in and with Jesus, would now break down all the self-will of this disciple, even without his definitely understanding the connection between this washing and that blessedness; but we may safely assume more than that, and regard Peter as *now beginning to understand.* We cannot imagine him to be slow to apprehend the Lord's plain words, or to be utterly unable to perceive the Lord's wonted and sudden transition to a figurative meaning in all this. We cannot, therefore, agree with Braune's remark upon Peter's submission, "Right characteristic is this perfect change, with the same *externality!*" For how can it be proved that Peter tarried in the external meaning? To us, this would be less characteristic than unpsychological. We agree with Bengel, Petro sensus impuritatis propriæ obortus hæc verba dictavit: with Tholuck, "His consciousness of sin was awakened by these words:" with Baum.-Crusius, "The words of Peter enter into the impersonal and universal meaning of the Lord's words." Thus alone can we understand, in a sense worthy of the Apostle, the instant retractation of his οὐ μὴ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, the impetuous going beyond of the offer of his hands and his head. This last is very generally taken as a running to the other extreme, instead of adhering to the simple will of Christ—that the feet should be washed. Although there may be some slight trace of this spirit perceptible, and although our Lord does actually in ver. 10 limit him once more to the washing of the *feet*, yet it must be remembered that in ver. 8 He had spoken only of washing generally, and that the unusual expression *head* (instead of face) will not suit the idea of a merely external sense. We understand the blessed Peter:—Yea, if Thou meanest it thus, if this

Hosted by Google

washing is thus connected with that washing of Thine which we all need and none so much as I; then take me, *the whole Simon*, I am indeed unclean from my *head* to my feet![1] Thus we find the expression most natural, entering into the Lord's spiritual meaning and yet rightly adhering to His figurative present action; and we have no more to do than add the edifying consideration for the preacher—that head and hands are not enough, the *heart* must be washed!

Ver. 10. Peter showed by the quickly understanding word which he spoke even in the midst of his false zeal, that he was already in his essential heart a λελουμένος; and therefore the Lord can proceed further to expound the more specific meaning of the washing of the feet. The distinction and contrast which He makes between a bath which perfectly washes the whole body, and the washing of the feet which is only subsidiarily needful, is founded upon custom, propriety, and ordinary language; but it is here made the symbol of a most important truth in relation to fellowship with Christ. As we have seen, the Lord's word in ver. 8 passed over into the more general signification, while yet, not to break off the connection altogether, the expression *νίπτειν* used for partial washings remained; hence, Peter also, with all his earnestness of desire to yield himself up to a total washing, can mention only individual members. The Lord now corrects the incongruity of the well-meant expression, and attributes to the disciples collectively, with the exception of one, an already existing purity in the main; while He thus most graciously restrains within bounds the excess in the desire of their representative Peter. Hence, and for that reason the evidently antithetic λελουμένος, which does not refer to the hands and the face (for of these also *νίψασθαι* and *νίπτειν* are used), but, as the ὅλος distinctly shows, to a proper bath. Our common version, therefore, needs correction here—Wer *gebadet* ist.[2] It was, generally speaking, customary before meals, espe-

[1] As Nonnus paraphrases, *ναὶ πάλιν, ἣν ἐθέλῃς, καὶ ὅλον δέμας.*

[2] Lange protests against this, because the theocracy knew nothing of baths, only of washings and baptisms. We would not quarrel about the expression, but is it not here actually twofold, and as such to be reproduced? Is not the washing of the *whole body* (Heb. x. 22: comp. 2 Peter ii. 22), to be called a *bath?* Is not that our very word for the λουτρὸν of *baptism?*

Hosted by Google

cially for guests at a feast, to enter the bath; and this is enough for the mere truthfulness of the figure. Meanwhile, we doubt very much whether the disciples had done so on this occasion; for this was a species of luxury for the more distinguished, certainly was no rule in the simple life of Jesus with His Galilæans, at least we find no instance of such a preparation for a feast or a visit.[1] Assuredly, it might have been so at this time, just before the passover; but to our mind the word of Jesus is more emphatic and more clear, if we suppose this not to have been the case. For then, the *transition from the figure to the thing signified*, which the Lord, as every one must admit, now plainly makes, becomes more impressive and forcible.

Our λοῦσθαι (of which this of the disciples was only a *typical* beginning), is the laver of regeneration and renewing, in which we are perfectly washed at the commencement from all our former sins and defilements (1 Cor. vi. 11); and this principle of all further holiness, concurrent with our forgiveness, is an actual purification of the heart, of the whole inner man, through the Holy Ghost received by faith. (Acts xv. 8, 9.) He who remains faithful to this privilege, and does not again return to wallow in the mire (2 Pet. ii. 22), from which he had been delivered, needs not a second time this same universal washing; but he *does need* an incessantly repeated washing of the *feet;* with which he must walk upon or in the mire.[2] This is that continuous daily repentance in which we diligently aim to purify ourselves, that is, at the same time, to suffer ourselves to be purified, from all still adhering or new contracted filthiness of the flesh and spirit (2 Cor. vii. 1)—πᾶσα ῥυπαρία καὶ περισσεία κακίας, Jas. i. 21. This relation may in some sense be referred to *baptism* and the *Lord's supper*, inasmuch as the latter perpetually requires, as the confirmation and seal of our ἔχειν μέρος μετὰ τοῦ κυρίου, a perpetual repentance and believing acknowledgment of our sins. The *feet* signify, generally, the flesh, which still connects us with the earth, and through which we are ever susceptible of sin, even while the head may look towards

[1] Hence Dräseke is somewhat too confident: "they prepared themselves for every festival feast, at least, by a bath." So Lange makes this *necessary* preparation by a bath an argument that this was a passover meal.

[2] Nonnus: εἰ μὴ μοῦνα πόδεσσι καθάρσια νίπτρα πορείης εἰνοδίης.

Hosted by Google

heaven, the heart be heavenly-minded, and the hands by which we perform our Christian duty be to the utmost of our knowledge and will undefiled. We may, therefore, regard the spiritual feet-washing (with Meyer elsewhere), as "*the lower nature* in its subjection to the constant necessity of a renewal unto holiness." Yet, inasmuch as with the feet we must walk in duty, and walking and working are in their real meaning one and the same, and the feet must stand and walk uprightly in order to the integrity of the work of our hands, what is said of them must hold good also of the hands: hence, David Ps. xxiv. 6, and Asaph Ps. lxxiii. 13, wash their hands in the perpetual service of God, comp. Jas. iv. 8, 1 Tim. ii. 8; hence, also, in the typical ordinances of the priests, Ex. xxx. 18, 19, both hands and feet are so referred to. The feet are named particularly here, because they would most appropriately suit the application to that condescending performance of such purifying service to others, which the Lord purposed to dwell upon afterwards. "It is a muddy world through which we all have to pass," as one says; and the rule, Touch not the unclean thing! has many exceptions in the case of the pure through the claims of their duty. It is not always without hurt to ourselves that we discharge these duties, such is the infirmity of our flesh, and such the never-resting desire of the tempter to injure us. "The devil lets no saint reach heaven with clean feet." (Luther.) And it is of the utmost importance that we never learn lightly to esteem this ever necessary cleansing. On the one hand, the consciousness that we have been once washed throughout and made clean should not be extinguished into despondency; and, on the other, we should ever remember, for our security against false confidence, that our feet *need* washing. He who neglects this, and is not ready, when the Lord comes, to accept His cleansing, is in great danger of falling again into a state in which he will have no part in Him:—and so the ἐὰν μὴ νίψω σε has its appropriate place of warning in the middle. And even this feet-washing is an actual washing, which can be effected, as in the first λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας, only by the spirit and grace of God; the slightest particle of dust that adheres to us cannot be washed away by ourselves. Zinzendorf's meaning is quite good when he says, "*As soon as* the heart prays for the

Hosted by Google

feet, they are washed"—but this expression betrays some slight tendency to antinomian security, and to the placing of justification in the stead of holiness, whereas it should ever be unto holiness. More proper would it be to say, As soon as the heart prays to the Lord to wash the feet, they are washed *by Him*.

If any one of the disciples was dull enough of apprehension, though this is scarce supposable, to have hitherto misunderstood the Lord, His last saying is distinct and decisive as to the spiritual meaning of His words:—Ye are clean (as ch. xv. 3, to which we must refer for the exposition of this word)—*but not all!*[1] There is *one among you* (ch. vi. 70) whom I have externally washed (hardly—whom I will now wash)—but that avails him nothing. Let it be carefully observed, that, on the one hand, the Lord does not in His gentleness point out the traitor for general opprobrium; and, on the other, how earnestly He makes him the basis of an indefinite general warning. This warning should resound in the midst of the narrowest circle of disciples.

Vers. 12–15. *Their* feet, that is, the disciples', ver. 5, therefore the feet of all. The ὅτε οὖν ἔνιψεν here intermediate tells us plainly that Peter was not the last of all, and that the Lord after the colloquy with him (in which the completed act was presupposed), continued with the remainder who also *needed* it. The work is now done, and now follows the promised information, so far as the anticipation of it which Peter had occasioned rendered it necessary. The *first* point in the explanation is this:—*I alone* can and I will wash you, as in that universal washing so also in the future incessant washing of your feet. Let not this be overlooked! But it has been already said, and the Lord hastens to its *second* meaning:—Ye also must act in like manner one towards another, at least in washing one another's feet, so far as by My help ye may be mutually serviceable to that end. The *question* coming first points back to the *first* meaning; but includes the other now first to be opened up. Do ye know, do ye now well understand, according to My words to Peter and you all (ye are clean), what I designed to intimate and promise, that I have washed and would wash you? The question as it

[1] Thus much is true; but it is altogether incorrect to say, with Dräseke, "So far, until now, the Lord's words had reference to the body."

Hosted by Google

regards this first meaning the Lord tacitly answers for them with Yes; but he goes further at once, without waiting to hear it, with a new answer:—Ye do not, nevertheless, know its full meaning, and I will now tell you all.[1] Not the less, however, is His general question a great and comprehensive word for all who should ever call Him Master and Lord, and themselves His disciples; for in these last discourses, especially, the most specific meaning, as connected with the local event, is blended and combined with the most universal. The great question may be applied to the thing which was here signified, as well as to the symbolical action itself which set it forth. From the cross of propitiation He puts to all professing Christians, and to all who are truly His own, the piercing question, Know ye what I have done unto you? (Forasmuch as ye *know!* 1 Pet. i. 18.) Alas, too many of them know it not; and therefore they know not, like those who crucified, what *they* do by their continuance in sin. Moreover, to baptism and the supper of the Lord, and every other ordinance of the church which symbolizes the grace of Christ, we may apply the question,—Will ye not come by experience to know the reality of this mystery, that I may do to you internally, what I have already *done* by way of promise and pledge in external ordinances?

Φωνεῖν might signify invocation or address, and then ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ ὁ κύριος would be in the vocative, as indeed they might; but we prefer with Winer, and many in past times, to take φωνεῖν for *nominare*, call. This seems to us more natural, and more conformable to the καλῶς λέγετε. When ye speak of Me, ye say—The Master, the Lord. We may compare not only Matt. xxiii. 8 for the one, as Matt. vii. 21 for the other; but also Matt. xxvi. 18, John xi. 28 with Matt. xxi. 3, as the transition to Luke xxiv. 34; John xx. 25, xxi. 7. The Master is *believed*, the Lord is *obeyed*. He meekly assumes the simple "Master," adding to it the "Lord," which latter then again, we observe, significantly comes first in ver. 14. Jesus to us is both,

[1] Thus we interpret the Lord's meaning differently from many, Dräseke to wit, who passes over the first most plainly expressed meaning—I must wash you! but takes for granted the second—So must ye also one another! as obvious to all. "The Lord's meaning was clear as day, even before He explained it. But He gave *words* to the general feeling of all."

Hosted by Google

as He cannot but testify even here, in this work of His profound humility, in order that that work may be understood; indeed, He cannot yet disclose all to these disciples, because the pre-typified work of redemption was not yet accomplished—but *we*, as they did afterwards, know more; we call Him *Saviour* and *Redeemer*, including this in our κύριος. And now, though most unexpectedly to the disciples, the commandment is urged, as in imitation of *His work*—καὶ ὑμεῖς ὀφείλετε. If I, your Lord and Master, did not in My humility and love count it too vile a thing to wash your feet—how can ye refrain from doing the same, when and as far as ye may do like Me as My disciples? It has been said that the Lord in His condescension does not intimate the great disparity, but places Himself on a level with His disciples: this, however, is not true, for the contrast comes out with double force in ὀφείλετε and ἀλλήλων. Grotius: multo magis vos, qui *conservi* estis, debetis. Ver. 15, finally, turns into the general statement, that *all* Christ's acts are for an example to His followers, comp. 1 Pet. ii. 21. It is also true, as we shall see, that the mutual feet-washing embraces in reality the whole *collective* duties of Christian charity among Christ's disciples; ὑπόδειγμα, too, must retain its *most specific* reference, inasmuch as it here indicates (as elsewhere something typical, figurative) a *symbolical action*.

Are we then literally and externally to wash one another's feet? Assuredly, in case that ever becomes a needful service of love—and other still more menial and repulsive services are we to perform. But the proper meaning of our Lord's commandment, taken in the light of all His explanation, is not this external one: hence, He does not say, *what* I have done, but, *as* I have done. Böhmer's strange attempt to vindicate for the washing of the feet a "sacramental dignity" (Stud. u. Krit. 1850, 4)—needs no refutation. But Herder's zeal goes improperly to the other extreme:—"To repeat this symbolical act of feet-washing, in spite of all objections of climate and usage, would be a mere presumptuous aping of holy actions." This is to look with unjustifiable contempt upon those sincere and childlike men who have felt it right to confirm and strengthen themselves in the performance of the thing signified by performing also the symbolical act itself; and of *these* we cannot say, that they have

Hosted by Google

" petrified into a dry ceremonial what was intended to teach the spirit which should animate our whole life." (Dräseke.) The traces of such a custom in the early church, though as late as the fourth century, are to be found collected in Bingham, iv. 394; Luther did not disapprove of it, if performed in simplicity and from a good nature; the Moravian Brethren have their Pedilavium at the present time, though they discreetly leave it without any compulsory enactment. It is, however, an important circumstance, as warning against the desecration of a holy thing by lack of simplicity and purity in ourselves, that we find nothing in the New Testament account of the apostolical age of any symbolical feet-washing. In 1 Tim. v. 10, the whole matter is placed in its right position: in cases of necessity, the thing itself is to be done, but it is the type of lower services of charity in general.[1] As it regards the caricatures of this sacred duty which appears in the vain ceremonial of some churches, they condemn themselves to every open eye; and Bengel's sarcasm, so often quoted, may be ever applied to them:—" It would be more to be admired if, for instance, the Pope were *in serious humility* to wash the feet of one king, instead of the feet of twelve paupers."[2]

In its deepest and most general sense our Lord's commandment to wash one another's feet, as He himself had done, is the same new one commandment—to love one another as He had loved us, vers. 34, 35. Love is humility, love delights to serve the necessities as well of body as of soul: here we have the twofold signification of the feet-washing, the former, however, being itself only a figure of the second, which essentially is the sole meaning. First, and in general, we should, in the most internal humility, after the pattern of our Lord's humility, never be too lofty or too prudent to perform acts of service to our neighbour. And then, secondly, we should as brothers in Christ be affectionately and mutually helpful in cleansing one another from the sins which still adhere to us, and *to that end* be ever humbly disposed to stoop down to our brother's soiled feet. External services of love may admit of comparison with this washing of the

[1] For this second meaning is, to our mind, the undertone of the text.

[2] Richter's Hausbibel, again:—Many are rather disposed to wash one another's heads than one another's feet.

Hosted by Google

feet; they may, indeed, be more menial and difficult than that, although, after all, they cannot reach the depth of condescension in our *Lord and Master's* washing His disciples' feet. In Lu. x. 34, 37, we have such a work of mercy, as a ὑπόδειγμα for all doing *likewise*.[1] Every disciple should be rejoiced to take the place of a *servant* to the servants of *his Lord;* in the spirit of those words of Abigail in the presence of David, 1 Sam. xxv. 41. Where there is necessity, love does the work in person, and is not satisfied always with laying out its twopence for the sick and the poor. It fulfils with readiness *difficult, unwonted, despised, yea, even loathsome* offices—as Dräseke expresses himself, preaching against effeminacy and backwardness to the hard duties of religion. But the proper spiritual work of washing the feet in our Saviour's meaning, is expressed in Gal. vi. 1, 2. It is already taken for granted that we have *forgiven* our brother if his fault was a trespass against ourselves; but we are also bound, as brethren in common, to apply ourselves to his defilement, if by any means we may help him to regain his purity through the grace of Christ. And here comes into specific application our Lord's fundamental principle, Mark ix. 35. Here must we lay aside our titles of "Lord and Master," even as He did His, and by doing so approved Himself to be, and became, their Lord and Master; the more we are able to serve and help, the higher will be our position and character in Christ. We must go beyond the quiet and secret enjoyment of our own grace, gird ourselves with the towel of Christ, and take from Him constantly the true water of the purifying Spirit, first for our own hands and feet, that we may be able spiritually to approach our brother, and come to him as the true *messengers and ministers* of Him who alone doeth all things by us. Nor must we ever forget the consolatory *wiping*, which completes the act! To such conduct towards others are we called and sent as purified ourselves, in such mutual dealing do we ourselves become perfectly clean. Another doeth this for me in return, if I need it—this I should ever bear in mind, and to this the ἀλλήλων significantly points. Here becomes that λόγος an ἀληθινός (ch. iv. 37)—one hand

[3] Luthardt should have read all that I have here said, expressly denying the limitation of the feet-washing to such "external offices of love," before he attributed to me such narrow views.

Hosted by Google

washes the other. Therefore thou shouldst suffer thyself also to be washed of the Lord *through* His disciples. Whoso refuses this is thus condemned by Rieger: "Christ was in this case too high for Peter, and His servants are too low for you!" Are we in the highest sense *ministers* of the Lord, *ἀπόστολοι* pre-eminently,—then let us especially wash each other's feet, as every man his own before the Lord! Luther says rightly, "Thus this example of washing the feet has a special reference to such as hold office in the church;" but we must not, with Lampe, restrict the whole precept, as well as ver. 10 itself, to the Apostles, whose *feet* in the bringing good tidings in an evil world need washing.[1]

Vers. 16, 17. What the Lord had already said, Matt. x. 24; Lu. vi. 40, and repeats with another application, Jno. xv. 20, has here obviously (see, however, ver. 18) the simple, proverbially striking, meaning that the servant and messenger should not deem himself too high to perform any service which his Lord who sent him had previously performed. Thus is struck down every lofty feeling which would say, Should I abase myself so low as to wash the feet of such an one? That would not be becoming in me! And for this the Lord substitutes, Should I be lofty enough to dare to refuse such a service? Would *that* be becoming in me? The special title—*ἀπόστολος* (Lu. vi. 13)—which here alone occurs in St John, is designedly carried back to its general meaning, and made parallel with *δοῦλος*;—and what other title of honour can assume anything beyond this first and most distinctive title in the kingdom of God? The *ταῦτα* and *αὐτά* combines this last enforcement of the humble mind with the previous requirement of the work of humility; and thus the clear and most impressive precept points to a universal *internal and external* "doing" thereafter. For a mere external doing the Lord never admits. There is too often a great gulf fixed—not only between the

[1] For this he quotes Apollinarius and Heracleota from the Catena: Pedum hæc lotio quid arcanum hic insinuat, quale v. gr. vide baturesse præparatio pedum Apostolicorum ad opus Apostolicum. Mundatis siquidem illos pedibus mittit, concessâ iis puritate conspicuos, ut sic orbem terrarum peragrare possent, salutis nuntia promulgantes, luxta quod legitur: Quam speciosi pedes evangelizantium pacem.

Hosted by Google

knowing what we should do and the actual performance of it —but also between the *knowing* that we are not greater than our Lord and the actual conduct of our heart in humility. Alas, for an unblessed mere solitary knowledge! *Woe* unto them who knew their Master's will and neither prepared themselves inwardly, nor did according to His will outwardly! Lu. xii. 48. Who, indeed, is capable of doing this, even with the word and the symbol before him? The symbol must first itself be experienced, the Lord must first wash us and continually wash us:—then only do we know what He hath done to us; and then does the pardoned and purified spirit feel the full force of the obligation to do likewise unto all as Christ has done to him. On the other hand, nevertheless, the mere knowledge of what He said serves, inasmuch as the grace to experience it was therein offered, to condemn us in a twofold sense if we do not by experience and practice press forward to a living knowledge in that higher sense of which St Bernard speaks; Tantum scimus, quantum operamur. Similarly Dräseke, who admirably refers to the future *practical knowledge* of the Apostles, in which they learned more and more profoundly to understand the words—Thou shalt *know* hereafter!

Ver. 18. The three yet remaining verses stand, as B.-Crusius thinks, "affectingly detached, in broken sentences;" yet have they a very close connection, even including the last. The Lord returns back in sorrow, having been viewing His *Apostles* as a whole, to that saying—*But not all!* To the unhappy Judas, although he calls Him Master and is numbered among His Apostles, He cannot say μακάριος εἶ, because not even the first knowledge is his, which is here ascribed to all the rest; and He must now in connection with this λέγειν except him once more. But He now adds most plainly that there is only one who must thus be excluded, referring plainly by the ἐξελεξάμην to ch. vi. 70. On account of the similarity in the expression, many insist, with Euthym., Maldonatus, Grot., B.-Crusius, and Alford, that the Lord here also still includes Judas—"I know who ye all are whom I have chosen." But we think, with others, that the election here, as in ch. xv. 16, has reference merely to the faithful, and find in it the distinction referred to in ch. vi. between a first and a second election.

Hosted by Google

Judas has *already* (ver. 2) failed to make his calling and election sure: he has *undone* it. Amid the grief with which this pierces His soul (see presently ver. 21), the Lord consoles Himself with the foreseeing and permissive *counsel of God* which the *Scripture* foreannounces. Ἀλλ' ἵνα must be complemented by a simple τοῦτο γέγονε (as Matt. xxvi. 56); and by no means, as B.-Crusius explains it,—ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς, it was necessary that ye should thus have been chosen, not every one honest and pure! For this thought would border on the error that Judas was appointed to his specific sin, and not that his sin was an event of his own free determination which was foreseen.

Concerning the interpretation of Ps. xli. as a prophecy of Christ, we must refer to the details in our commentary, where we have shown that this entire psalm, which rests upon David's own typical experiences, treats actually from ver. 5 downwards of Christ, the דָּל or עָנִי κατ' ἐξοχήν, whom all should consider attentively (ver. 1); but in such a manner that the experiences of His members and followers are combined with those of their Head and Forerunner. This harmonises with the connection between vers. 16 and 20; and shows that ver. 16 already points forward to the same meaning as afterwards in ch. xv. 20. And that deep meaning is,—It is for you to act in love and humility as I have done, although you may have to do with many a Judas, whose feet ye wash in vain; for ye are not above your Master. For this let your hearts be prepared! Hence, it is not as many say, who would vindicate the meaning of this application—Christ makes all the sufferings of all His saints; but conversely—All the followers as well as all the types of Christ make His experience. *This* is the key to the psalm, which opens it to us as a typical psalm in the true meaning of the word, so that in the mind of the prophetic Spirit Christ Himself (with His people) is actually signified in it. Hence it is as necessary as it is remarkable, that in the quotation the אֲשֶׁר בָּטַחְתִּי בּוֹ—which could not be true of Jesus Himself—is omitted: for those other words must be substituted—I know whom I have chosen! On the other hand, the eating bread (in the original *His* bread) derives a fearful meaning from the participation in the sacramental supper; a meaning which must be applied for ever to all unworthy communicants, as well as to

Hosted by Google

al. betrayers of Christ who eat the bread of His Church.[1] Moreover, the whole passage, because it is not a literal and exclusive Messianic prophecy, but a typically comprehensive one, is reproduced in a free manner by Christ or the Evangelist. The Hebrew אוֹכֵל לַחְמִי, Sept. *ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου*, is here stronger, *τρώγων μετ' ἐμοῦ τὸν ἄρτον*, with allusion to the superabounding consummation of this in ver. 26. The Hebrew הִגְדִּיל עָלַי עָקֵב, Sept. very obscure *ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ πτερνισμόν*, is here quite simple and plain—*ἐπῆρεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ*. This last exhibits, in a figure of daring impudence, not merely the refractory revolt against the affectionate rule of the *teacher*, but by the *ἐπῆρεν* also the Satanic pride which trod under foot the humble Lord.[2] Comp. Heb. x. 29. From this mention of the uplifted foot in connection with the washing of the feet, there arise many thoughts which might be regarded as fanciful: we may refer to some of them in the words of others. Bengel in the Gnomon says, Tantum abest, ut fratrum pedes lavet! Hiller, in his life of Jesus in rhyme, thus speaks:—O humility unmatched: He washes the feet which trod upon Him!

Ver. 19. "*Οτι ἐγώ εἰμι* has not here, according to our feeling, the same absolute sense as in ch. viii. 24, though Luthardt regards it as just a repetition of that saying; but since the disciples' belief that Jesus was the Messiah is already taken for granted (see ver. 13), *ἵνα πιστεύσητε* means, rather, That ye may not cease to believe, or be led to mistake in this, comp. ch. xvi. 1. Augustin's solution is too narrow,—that I am He of whom *this* scripture speaks[3] more earnestly,—of whom this scripture *also*, as *all scripture* generally, speaks. For *ἡ γραφή* in connection with the citation is, as everywhere, said generally. Thus, that *everything* which *befalls* Me, even that which seems so repulsive to faith, is but the strict fulfilment of what was long ago foreseen and recorded; that I am the great typified

[1] Roos is too narrow when he says that although Jesus received attendance from others, yet now the disciples actually ate *His* bread. The profound and much more comprehensive expression needs no such justification.

[2] Which we may supplement here by way of improvement on our remarks in the Commentary.

[3] Nonnus: *ὅτι εἰμὶ ἐκεῖνος, τοῦ πέρι ψαλτῆρος ζαθέη μαντεύσατο φωνή.*

Hosted by Google

One throughout the Scriptures, and tell you before it has come to pass, in order that ye may see that I have not trusted him, he has not deceived *Me*, as Ahithophel did David, and many will you.

Ver. 20. It is constantly denied that this saying has any connection here with the preceding; and even Lücke joins with Gabler and Kuinoel in assuming it to be a gloss which has crept in from Matt. x. 40, or still better from Lu. ix. 48, and fallen to the end instead of following ver. 16, to which it should belong. But we see the connection most clearly, and find no link wanting; remembering, as said above, that the Lord is speaking in deep emotion, and that His contemplation passes from object to object abruptly, rather hinting His meaning than fully expressing it. There are many artificial methods of tracing the link which we must dismiss: the obvious one is the best, viz., that the honour of the Apostle's vocation would by no means be affected by either the present sin of this Judas, or the similar experience in the case of others which awaited them, ver. 18.[1] Is not this connection enough, is it not as it were the most befitting close of this entire discourse? The whole circle of the Apostles seemed to be disgraced and broken up by the treachery of Judas; and therefore the Lord *confirms* the faithful in their election, and that very fitly by a repetition of that earlier promise on which all depended. He does not design to say (B.-Crusius), "so much *greater* should be the dignity and honour of His faithful ones, they should be loved of God because they had kept themselves from the unfaithful." Such a comparative imports too much, but the positive

[1] Hezel finds here another exhortation to humility:—Remember that the honour which may be conferred on you, does not rest upon your persons but is Mine, even as I Myself give My honour back unto God!! Others again:—He who receiveth you shares your honour (but where is that said?), therefore overvalue not yourselves! Schleiermacher's, however, is a view somewhat more tolerable:—In humility and love we should come to others as sent of Him, that so we may be received; everywhere making it our care as servants to bring our Lord with us. But the point is brought out altogether too artificially. The penetrating Dräseke goes astray when he attributes to the Saviour the *tacita oppositio*:—Those, however, who receive *him* whom I send *not*, receive neither the Father nor Me! Meyer most strangely interprets it that the Lord promises to send *another* in the place of Judas, and exhorts the Apostles, by anticipation, to receive him affectionately into their circle.

Hosted by Google

sense remains: Be ye faithful ones of good courage, ye retain your honour as the messengers whom I shall soon send forth, the devil shall have no other among you![1] This is one thought which is obvious; but a deeper allusion must be added:—As I, though resisted by Judas, have been *received* by you and many others, so also shall ye not in vain be sent forth; your humble and laborious love shall not be contemned by all.

THE SECOND AND MORE DIRECT INDICATION OF THE TRAITOR, AFTER THE SUPPER.

(Chap. xiii. 26, 27.)

This is, according to our view of the whole procedure and connection, a *second* more direct indication of the traitor, which did not take place until after the supper. Thus there is no room for any contradiction between the Synoptics and St John. The *first* indication appears in vers. 21, 22, and coincides literally with what the Synoptics report; we, therefore, defer our exposition of ver. 21 to the last part of the work, and the context to which it belongs. The objection which Baur and many others urge so vehemently, that St John leaves no room anywhere for the insertion of the Supper, has been well answered by Hauff: no historical writer must be required designedly to show the place where circumstances which he omits should occur. We might satisfy ourselves with a confident *non liquet;* but every man must be allowed here his own unprejudiced opinion. Bengel's notion that ch. xiv. 31 first points to the going into the city to the passover, is assuredly the most violent and improbable supposition of any. We cannot interpolate the institution of the sacrament (with Paulus, Meyer, B.-Crusius, Kahnis) between vers. 30 and

[1] Rieger: "He revives their confidence again with regard to their future work, for the devil would take away from them all life and hope. Having accomplished his business with Judas, he would have all the rest think themselves no better than he—We are all disgraced, there is no faith among us, our whole order stinks. But no! The verily, verily, I say unto you, of Jesus, stands between them and despair. He can justify them to themselves, that they are sent of Him."

Hosted by Google

31, or (with Neander and Ebrard) between vers. 32 and 33;[1] nor can we insert it still later (with Lücke and Lange), nor (with Olshausen) at the end of the chapter, after ver. 38. The reasons for and against this decision must be referred at last to our own subjective feeling, although a profound examination of the question would afford much room for argument. We assume, for our own part, that the right place for its insertion is between vers. 22 and 23, notwithstanding the apparent continuity of the connection. For from ver. 23 down to ch. xiv. 31 everything seems to go on in an absolutely unbroken thread.

A correct harmony of the four Evangelists, and especially the letter of St Mark and St Luke, forbids us to doubt that Judas received the sacrament with the rest, being included, as the lost one, for a testimony in the "for you:" this has been generally assumed from the earliest times, and has never been contested save on internal grounds. The πλὴν ἰδού of Lu. xxii. 21 is not to be easily dismissed by a reference to the freedom of St Luke's connection generally (Ebrard); this would be an altogether too free transposition. The words are placed in our Lord's lips, as part of His continuous discourse; and this is a very different thing from the allusion to the strife in ἐγένετο δὲ καί, ver. 24, which we admit to be retrospective. Still less can we accept Wieseler's artificial application, who finds in the ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης a proof that the reference to the traitor had already preceded during the eating of the meal. To us the stern word of Mark xiv. 23 is unconditionally decisive—And they *all* drank of it (comp. Matt. xxvi. 27); for the *twelve* are mentioned in the context, without a single syllable about the removal of one of their number.[2]

We see in this πλήν of St Luke that the Saviour in the oppression of His spirit cannot, even after the institution of the

[1] Ebrard speaks very inappropriately of an open disclosure of the traitor while they were eating and before the sacrament; and then regards Jno. xiii. 31, 32 as a strictly suitable *introduction* to the supper.

[2] Everything in St John tends to this, wherever the Supper is inserted, but the Synoptics are most decisive. The rigorous consecution of events does not "tolerate" the idea of the absence of Judas (as Süskind Stud. u. Krit. 1852. 4. says too gently, after Wieseler). Kahnis in vain tries to persuade us that the words of institution are against the presence of Judas, since Jesus could not have said with regard to him—For *you!*

Hosted by Google

Supper, put away, as it were, the thought of the traitor. The serpent's sting is still keenly felt. The impious man departs not, remains quietly among them, and even joins in the question, Is it I?—he eats and drinks with them, and waits till the enforced command bids him go his way, that the Son of man may speak of His glorification and of His love. Once more there is a sharp conflict, between the man of sin and the pre-eminent Man of grace, the first-born of Satan and the Son of God—a final contest of love and gentleness for that wretched soul, though in the consciousness that the frightful issue will be that in the case of this soul at least the Devil will be the victor. The rest of the beloved disciples, too, cannot shake from their thoughts the fearful word, that a traitor was among them; the Lord's reiterated word, Lu. xxii. 21, 22, gives them the occasion of repeating their questioning as recorded in ver. 23, and this according to our harmony is the immediate parallel of Jno. xiii. 23.

"Who is the first among them, who can dismiss from his mind the personal question (Lord, *is it I?*), and turn his observation upon *the others?* Strange, that it is he who should have been the last, he who should have been most anxiously busy in testing himself—Simon Peter!" Thus says Dräseke, and with some measure of propriety. But we may also say with confidence, that now, after the supper, each one of the eleven must have known, in his own honest heart, that he was not the traitor. *Peter* and *John* come prominently forward, as the representatives of this consciousness—they sitting or lying, in all probability, on either side of Jesus. St John at least indicates his own position —ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ (comp. Lu. xvi. 22, and Jno. i. 18); that is, Jesus, according to custom, reclined on His left side, His head towards the table, His feet turned backwards in such a manner that the beloved John lay confidentially near His bosom. And as Peter is able thus secretly to hint his meaning to John, it is most natural to suppose that he was on the opposite side of Jesus, and either intimated what he had to say behind the Saviour's back, or, as the *νεύειν* may include, whispered it to John.[1] Peter's well-intended, but overcurious spirit of question-

[1] Nonnus, excellently, λάλῳ δ' ἐρέεινε σιωπῇ. We cannot approve, with Luthardt, of Lachmann's reading—καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Εἰπὲ τίς ἐστιν. Schulz'

Hosted by Google

ing, which goes on down to ch. xxi. 21, is very familiar to us; his curiosity led him afterwards, however, to his denial. We may regard a good intention as prompting the present question (Grotius: tum ut innoxii extra suspicionem sint, tum ut sibi caveant ab impuro); yet it is scarcely to be questioned that rather a kind of curiosity than any such reflection induced him to put it. Affecting and characteristic is the pure simplicity with which the beloved disciple fulfils the request of the curious one, even as afterwards, ch. xviii. 16, he introduced him into the palace of the high priest.[1] Similarly noteworthy and significant is the priority which *Peter* is constrained to concede to him who was nearer than himself.[2] But most affecting and most significant is it to observe, that Jesus can no more decline the request of the beloved *John*, than he could that of Peter. Peter himself might have received a similar answer to that which he afterwards received,—What is that to thee? Look into thyself!

Ver. 26. Nevertheless He mentions not the name; this was, on the one hand, impossible to His deep emotion, and, on the other, would have been audible to the rest:—He veils the reply in an accompanying sign. We are firmly convinced that *this* word, *softly* spoken to John, is quite different from that of Matt. xxvi. 23. For there Judas himself dips his hand in the dish, here the Lord dips and gives it; that word was not, properly speaking, an answer, but merely the reiterated general intimation—One of My familiar companions, now at the table with Me, one among you: for if He had had reference to an actual dipping of Judas at that moment, the continued ignorance of the disciples would have been inconceivable. Least of all can we tolerate the hypothetical question by which Braune (and Lange) would reconcile

argument that John never uses the *optative* has no force. That Peter attributes to the beloved John a knowledge of the traitor we do not regard as "characteristic" of him, but, rather, inconceivable; for Peter, though he might speak precipitately, never spoke thoughtlessly. The foundation of this reading may have been a correct gloss—a λέγειν may have been originally in the text.

[1] Hiller's remark seems quite unsuitable to John's character—"John takes the hint, being himself equally curious in this matter."

[2] Lampe: Videant Pontificii, quomodo Primatum Petro vindicent, cum Johannes primum et in mensa et in corde Christi locum obtineat, et Petrus ipse ejus patrocinio indigeat.

Hosted by Google

the two—"Did not Judas himself out of a certain presumption once more dip into the dish, because custom required it?" All is better harmonised, if we regard this as the *second* indication occurring after the principal meal. Then the ψωμίον would not be a portion of the paschal lamb, but intinctus panis as the Vulg. has it, and the ἔμβαμμα not the sauce of bitter herbs, but something else similar. More important than these trivialities is the *significance* of the word and sign, by which the Lord once more and conclusively confirms the prophecy of the Psalm, and makes His appeal to His most unworthy ἑταῖρος (Matt. xxvi. 50). The offered morsel is—to speak with Dräseke—"the affecting sign of a heretofore relation." And still more, it is an especial and confidential token of love, on account of which some of the rest might think the wretched man highly favoured.[1] This is His love unto the end even to the lost among His own; this is its final appeal to the hard heart.

But this very point marks the final decision and separation. In chap. vi. 70 it was said of Judas—διάβολός ἐστιν, but that was only the beginning. He had at this time already—after Satan's suggestion (here at ver. 2, what Luke xxii. 3, with less strict distinction, terms εἰσῆλθε δὲ σατανᾶς)—trafficked with the high priests, and pledged himself to the betrayal. But all this was not yet final, Satan now went further in the process of his destruction and put forth a more active influence upon him: but still there was some slight thread of connection with the grace and truth of God in Jesus, which might yet avail for salvation. Now, now first, *after* this sop (Bengel urges us to note well—not *with* it!) Satan, according to *St John's* most profound observation, entered into him—"took *full* possession of him"—or whatever else our language will allow for the rendering of the equally literal and figurative expression. Satan down to the very last develops his plans through external occasions and circumstances. But the external occasion is only the veil which conceals the unsuccessful contact and conflict of the love of Jesus with the wickedness of the traitor. It was not, as has been said, wrath at being now detected, which decided his course, for Judas

[1] Kahnis: "The prophecy becomes, at the moment of its disclosure, fulfilment. Remarkable, that the sign of it is a gift of love—it is love which challenges the evil to its utmost iniquity."

Hosted by Google

knew *that* with increasing certainty since Matt. xxvi. 25: and that the gift of this sop was intended to be a revelation of him *before the* disciples, could not and would not be needed by Judas, at this moment. Suffice, that in the awful τότε of the Evangelist there is reference to a hidden and most internal procedure, which only *one* profound glance discerned.[1]

Ver. 27. And the eye of Jesus is upon him. What a transition at this crisis, celebrated in hell and mourned in heaven! The last request of love—and then the *giving up* to a reprobate mind, to do the deed of reprobation. (Rom. i. 28.) On the one hand, it is, indeed, clear, from the position of the decisive ὃ ποιεῖς (*not*, what thou wilt do), that ποίησον is not equivalent to an absolute imperative for the deed, but can involve no other than the permission of devoting wrath, into which grace now suddenly changes.[2] Scriptural parallels of *such* an imperative are to be found, *e.g.*, in the word to Ahimaaz, 2 Sam. xviii. 23, still more definitely in God's tempting saying to Balaam, Num. xxii. 20,[3] most definitely in our Lord's own λύσατε, John ii. 19, and πληρώσατε Matt. xxiii. 32. Zech. xi. 12 also closely corresponds in prophecy. Nevertheless, on the other hand, the dignity of our Lord, who could not be absolutely betrayed by Judas but gave Himself freely up, requires that something actually imperative should be discerned in the words. Not as if (according to the strange notion of Cyril) the invocation was addressed to Satan, whose act alone that of the possessed Judas was; he into whom Satan enters thus is not possessed but *doeth* himself what he doeth, as the words here therefore expressly run. But it is, first, a *commandment* of the *obedience* of Jesus, surrendering Himself up to the Father's will, for it means—*I am ready*, and will not withstand thee! By no means is it (as Lange says)

[1] Not, as Hezel coarsely imagined, that his form, mien, and language were all such as if Satan had directly taken possession of him! Or, as Hess somewhat more cautiously, "Whosoever looked at him carefully might read it in his demeanour."

[2] Grotius addresses a similar mode of speaking from profane writers. Seneca: fac, si quid facis. Plautus: age, si quid agis. Euripides: δρᾷ γ' εἴ τι δράσεις.

[3] Less strictly parallel is the commission to the evil spirit, 1 Kings xxii. 22, because in this *figurative* presentation the רוּחַ שֶׁקֶר may yet have been a good spirit in the service of the Lord.

Hosted by Google

a request which has reference to the period of the sufferings of the victim under the sacrificial knife—"Let not my martyrdom *be long!*" Jesus, even here, when He obeys and yields Himself up, *rules over time and hour;* consequently the word is also, as Ambrose rightly saw, a command—*Get thee hence!*[1] and Judas, as Satan within him, must obey this behest. This is slightly perceptible in the τάχιον, which assuredly might be translated—citius quam prius voluisti. Thus this *second* word, finally, to the betrayer contains something majestic beyond that first, simply assenting Σὺ εἶπας of Matt. xxvi. 25. That signified, for the first,—I see through thee! *Thou knowest it*—I also! But still the deed lay in the future, as a design which Satan had put in his heart. Now, rather, when the *doing* (internally) begins in Judas:—What thou doest do; I not merely suffer it, I command thee to do it soon, now! Thou willest it—I also will it—thou hast Me in thy hands!

Nothing external betrayed the betrayer, the finished hypocrite, down to the last; so that the other disciples even in these words—"which their deeply-moved Master could not speak without an extraordinary emotion" (as Dräseke says)—discerned nothing extraordinary. Ebrard's view (S. 641 note) appears to us quite erroneous, that the disciples might have well known that Judas was the traitor, but that they did not believe the final accomplishment of his wicked purpose to be the matter in question just then. If Judas was indeed marked out to them as such, they could not have understood the mysterious ὃ ποιεῖς otherwise than of its real meaning; certainly, they could not have referred it to his ordinary business and duty. But it must be assumed that *no man* knew or observed anything, save John, who as the reporter of this ignorance excepts himself as having known, and *probably* Matthew also, see Matt. xxvi. 25. As it respects John, at least, the matter is clear from vers. 25, 26—which Luthardt's protest has forgotten. There had not been time enough to communicate the answer received even to Peter, between the closely connected giving of the sop, entering in of Satan, and command of Jesus—Do quickly! It is quite clear that their supposition as to the buying for the feast does not suit the day before

[1] Quite incorrect is Hess' conversion of this—"Jesus, *when He saw him arise* to depart, adds nothing but these words."

Hosted by Google

Thursday (for which, however, the critics make this a proof!), even as the hasty sending away from the table so late in the evening would then appear needless. Rather, as Guericke, Tholuck, and Luthardt rightly infer, they could have thought of this only if it was already the beginning of the festal evening, and thus the last moment in which anything neglected before might be procured for the feast. That, moreover, as Tholuck well remarks, "their suppositions were confused and distracted," appears by the second of them, which is still more improbable than the first. For the giving of alms was not so hasty a matter, and was much too late as a contribution towards the procurement of the paschal lamb. St John thus designs to describe to us the deep mystery of these occurrences, known only to himself, the beloved and trusted,—with the most artless embarrassment of all the rest.

One more most pregnant remark he gives at the conclusion of the whole, in the absolute and emphatic *ἦν δὲ νύξ*.[1] This does not simply intimate that it was late evening, but signifies something which corresponds with the previous mention of Satan. It was the breaking in of the hour of the power of darkness, Lu. xxii. 53. It was not needful, as Lücke requires, that St John should use *σκοτία*; the *νύξ* here intimates the coincidence of external and internal darkness. It was night *in the soul of Judas*—this also is included in it, by this fearful word the Evangelist dismisses him into the darkness without, with the yet deeper and more real night in his own spirit. It was night, further, in a broad circle around Judas, the leader and forerunner of the enemies of Jesus—night in the hearts of many, condensed and mighty darkness, to obscure the Light of the world in the fearfully hidden mystery of the Passion. *Nevertheless*—and this is its final emphasis in contrast with what follows—Jesus goes on to speak of His glorification, of His love, His departure to the Father, the coming of the Comforter, His own return with

[1] For *ὅτε ἐξῆλθε* must be connected (according to Lachmann's text) with the following verse, as the *οὖν* makes evident; and not with the previous (as Knapp has it). *Ὅτε ἐξῆλθε* following the sufficiently emphatic *εὐθέως ἐξῆλθεν* seems to us as bald, as the mere *Λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς* would be weak and unconnected. Bengel's critical feeling is here sacrificed to his marvellous harmony, according to which what follows was spoken by Jesus on the next morning.

Hosted by Google

peace, the victory over the world, eternal joy and glory—all words of light and life, which have approved their full meaning in the hearts of all who are not what Judas was,—in the overcoming and extinction of all darkness.

THE GLORIFICATION OF THE SON OF MAN; THE ENTRANCE INTO THE INACCESSIBLE; THE NEW COMMANDMENT.

(Ch. xiii. 31–35.)

Those who, with Bengel, interpose an entire night at this point, give up the force of this most significant and sublime *Νῦν*: it is scarcely imaginable that the Lord could have thus begun a new and abrupt discourse. The hypothesis which inserts here the institution of the Supper, gives a meaning, indeed, to the *Νῦν*, but does violence to the arrangement of the Evangelist. If we are told that vers. 31, 32 are an appropriate *introduction* to the Sacrament, we must avow that—apart from the unnatural disruption in the discourse, which runs on continuously from ver. 31 to ver. 38—our feeling cannot tolerate *after* the *νῦν ἐδοξάσθη* any further *σῶμα διδόμενον, αἷμα ἐκχυνόμενον.*—But St John's narrative and the entire scene becomes most clear and luminous, when we simply read it as it stands:—*εὐθέως ἐξῆλθεν—ὅτε οὖν ἐξῆλθε, λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς.*

What says He, and of what does He speak? Nothing further of Judas now; not until ch. xvii. 12 does His thought revert in deepest sorrow to the betrayer.

No, the Lord now pours forth *His last discourses*, which delayed His setting forth, and the *beginning of which*[1] is this *νῦν ἐδοξάσθη* ("a cry of exultation in the night in which He was betrayed")—the *end* of which is the High-priestly prayer—the *middle* of which is the *μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία*, the incentive to *faith εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ εἰς ἐμέ*—the *goal* set before the disciples, their *πιστεύομεν*, His *ἄρτι πιστεύετε*, ch. xvi. 30, 31.

The relation of the Νῦν,—which even now at this first outpouring anticipates the final petition (*δόξασόν σου τὸν υἱόν, δόξασόν με σὺ πάτερ*) as fulfilled,—*to the departure of Judas* does

[1] Which Luthardt also I. 267 admits and defends.

Hosted by Google

not consist in this, that Judas was a hindrance to the glorification, since his deed of darkness was to be instrumental in accelerating it. But there is a twofold thought to be traced here:—First, by the act of the traitor, now decisively commencing, the death of Jesus, that is, His glorification, now appears to be as a fact accomplished; and then, secondly, Jesus, after the removal of this opposing instrument of hell, this vainly loved one, over whose spirit He in the spirit had won the great *victory*,[1] can now first *speak* ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ concerning His glory. Jam quasi obice rupto torrentes gratiæ a labiis Jesu effunduntur—says Lampe.[2] And His words presently uttered, vers. 31–35, determine, if we will hear them, the old controversy between *faith* and *love*, as to which of them is the first, whether the ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως, Eph. vi. 23, or the πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη, Gal. v. 6. Neither of the two, if both are genuine and inseparable in one! Faith, truly, is the source, ground, and energy of the new creature; but a faith to which love is promised, of which love is predicated, and to which love is commanded in the working of the life-giving law of Christ. We have here in our Lord's words two *parallel* and *perfectly corresponsive* sayings:—a word for knowledge in order to *faith;* and a word for the heart (or the living truth of this knowledge) concerning *love*. The *one dogma* is the glorification of God in the Son of man, as of the Son of man in God; the *one commandment* the mutual love of His disciples, because and even as He loved them.

Ver. 31. Does the Lord's ἐδοξάσθη speak by anticipation of His *heavenly* exaltation? No more than in chap. xii. 23, 28, 33, to which this word looks back. The νῦν of itself is positive against this; and in ver. 32 the εὐθύς introduces first the antithetical, though closely connected, future δοξάσει. Consequently, while we must regard both glorifications as forming but one and the same, the one following immediately from the other, the distinction must be maintained that this *present* glorification is

[1] See Lange S. 1328 ff. upon this, and my exposition of Matt. xxvi. 24.

[2] Only that the glorification itself, of which He speaks, is something very different from what the tasteful Herder most tastelessly expresses:—"Now is the Son of man *satisfied among His own*—for their fellowship is purified!!"—Luthardt will find that which he adduces to supplement my meaning (ii. 290) laid down by myself as the fundamental thought.

Hosted by Google

the beginning and ground of *that which follows* as its consummation. In no other than the *death of the cross*, now regarded by Jesus as coming and come, present and accomplished, is the Son of man first of all glorified:—in this humiliation He is exalted, in this darkness of shame does His glory beam forth, from Golgotha go forth those attracting energies which are to wrest from Satan the world of mankind. At His proleptic glorification on the mount He spoke of His passion; but now from the beginning of His passion He speaks of His glorification. As *for Israel* the superscription upon the cross points out the *King* (and thereby repels every false and carnal notion of His kingdom)—so for *humanity at large* this word is the interpretation of the passion: Here is the *Son of man* thus glorified, so that *God in Him* is glorified!

But the glorification of God in the suffering and dying Son of man is a broad and deep comprehensive truth which we can perfectly apprehend only in three aspects. It embraces, first, when we *look into it*, the self-offering of God in the *person* of *this* Son of man as a great and solitary fact; secondly, when we *look back*, the shining forth of God in *human nature* generally, as the longed for goal of all aspiration and effort; thirdly, when we *look forward*, the *representation and offering* of God to humanity as the object of faith and love.

God is glorified ἐν αὐτῷ—assuredly *not* δι' αὐτοῦ, therefore, as we find it in Nonnus; as Erasmus' false correction of the Vulg. by *per eum* translates it; and as Lücke also insists, on the erroneous assumption that it is one with chap. xvii. 1, notwithstanding the decisive parallel of ἐν ἑαυτῷ in the next verse to our text.[1] Thus the Lord means, first of all, in Me, as Man, in *this* Son of man! This ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ could be said of no בֶּן־אָדָם before, of *none* after until he is one with Christ:—in this consists the pre-eminent personal δόξα of the One. As the second man He is at the same time the Lord from Heaven (1 Cor. xv. 47)—ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ (Heb. i. 3).—His δόξα is the δόξα τοῦ μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός. Thus in a certain sense God had been revealed and glorified in His entire human life; as we sing concerning the *infant* Jesus—"The Father's light and love beam forth from His new-born face; He

[1] Which, however, de Wette arbitrarily translates—*durch* sich selbst!

Hosted by Google

is the Sun of the new heaven, which sheds light upon the world otherwise sunk in darkness" (Freilinghausen). But who beheld this radiance of the Father's light and love? Who could utter St. John's ἐθεασάμεθα, among the children of men? The wor shipping wise men were not wise enough to discern God in the child new born—no Apostle fell before Him with Thomas' cry —Mary herself had but a faint presentiment of the hidden mystery. Yea, after thirty years during which the still light of His love had beamed forth from His graciousness at Nazareth, He began to manifest His glory:—the *power* of God in all His works down to the grave of Lazarus, the *love* of God in all His tenderness and humility towards the wretched. Yea, verily, throughout all His life, He stood before a God-dishonouring world—I honour My Father! The Father honoureth Me! *Of that* spake the voice—I *have* glorified My name! Jno. xii. 28. But still there followed then—καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω. And this had its wondrous accomplishment first in His *sufferings and death*. The great question then was, whether the Righteous One would approve Himself such, and be confirmed of the Father as sent to save and not to judge the world. He had finished the *work* of His *life*—but the greatest work, the work which gave all the rest its consummation, was still reserved for His passion. How then in this deepest ignominy is the highest honour, the glory of God, manifested? Precisely when all the sin of the world is exhibited around Him, closes in upon Him, and lies upon His spirit so that He is made sin—He is most gloriously manifested as *without* sin, as contending *against* sin, as supremely elevated *above* sin, even while He *bears* it. The *love* which shone brighter and brighter in the feet-washing and the supper, in its majesty of meekness and patience with Judas, is now glorified into an absolute and final victory over the hatred of hell. Not as elsewhere, that the Divine is darkened in the most devout Endurer—here there is the purest separation between light and darkness. It is night in Judas and in all His enemies, night comes into His own human soul, even to His Eloi, Eloi—but this Eloi! Eloi! remains uninvaded, light in the midst of darkness. As in the night on which He was born, heavenly glory shone around, so now after the night of His betrayal there is darkness even in the midst of day. *Nevertheless*,

Hosted by Google

out of Golgotha's deep obscurity there shines forth victoriously, —the *righteousness* of God, a first glorification already of the righteous Father—the *love* of God, which reveals itself and gives itself to us in this conquering Son of His love—thus, grace in justice, justice in grace, that is, the mystery of the *holiness* of God becomes manifest. Thus the purest *honour of God* shines forth in the deepest dishonour of this *Son of man*. All is human and all is Divine, the Father in Him performeth the work of this world-redeeming passion. The Ecce Homo is changed to the eye of faith into—*Behold Thy God!* In this man become thine, O humanity!

Thus we find in it, *secondly*, and looking backwards, the penetration of human nature by God as the longed-for goal of all human aspiration and seeking. But how was this aspired to before Christ? In the old covenant the grace which stooped to man wrestles from the beginning with sin, but cannot at once victoriously break through, because man's freedom must oppose his God, because the human nature must in its ground and universality be prepared for the revelation of God in it. Hence all was simple preparation, an aspiration and seeking awakened from above:—that is the deep-implanted mystical *germ* of Christ the Son of man, in whom finally dwelleth God. In spite of all Israel's hardness of heart, which therein represents humanity, God's honour and glory remained, for the sake of their germ of faith, *among* and *upon* them; but its design is to *come into them*. How sore was the conflict and wrestling of the Angel of the covenant with Jacob before His becoming man in the true Israel; of the Spirit of Christ in the people of flesh! Yea, at best it became an Israel which, like Simeon and Nathanael, waits; *types* of, and *preparations* for atoning sufferings are found from David down to the servant of God, Isa. liii.—but all is no more than aspiration and waiting. That Lev. xxvi. 11 should become a reality (comp. 2 Cor. vi. 16) remains ever the goal of their future. Daniel prophesies how, after the destruction of the *animal* might of all the kingdoms of the world, the true and holy *Son of man* comes before God and receives the kingdom of a God-pervaded pure *humanity* as the kingdom of God. That is the goal of Israel attained in Christ; for He is this Son of man, as the true David, the righteous servant Israel. He is *the new man in*

Hosted by Google

God, the *blossom* and *fruit* of humanity which had at length burst forth on the stem of Israel, through the faith of Mary uniting at length Abraham and Sarah in one. Not, as the old theology supposed, the suddenly descending Deus ex machinâ—for One who thus became man would not be properly and truly at the same time the Son of man. But still less, as the new unbelief supposes, altogether and solely springing up here below; the impregnation from above was consummated in the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, and only the eternal Son of the Father in the Son of Mary overcame sin and the world even to the glorification on the cross. But here is all that obscurer longing, aspiration, and search of *entire humanity* realised; for here the old discord is abolished, here God is in man and man in God. Humanity had not, indeed, utterly and for ever fallen away from God, else would it have been with Satan irredeemably lost; but that men, even the Gentiles, are still the offspring of God, is plainly proved by the seeking and feeling after Him who is *not far* from them, and yet so utterly unknown (Acts xvii.). Consciously and unconsciously all mankind seeks Him—and that rightly *in itself*, for not merely from without and above can God manifest Himself to His personal and free creatures. God meets this seeking after Him by preparatory grace; and this is a mystical Christ before Christ. Wherever the heathens came near to the true God, they became therein one with Israel; and so now they find with Israel *in Christ* the goal of all realisation. Never in other way—never independently of the person of *this* Son of man!

In this Jesus, and in Him alone, at first, because He is the incarnate Son of God, is human nature glorified into a Divine-humanity. This is the *new dogma*, the one and sole essential proposition for *faith*, which involves in itself, however, the whole fulness of theology—the simple apostolical saying, *God was in Christ*. Indeed, as the new commandment of love was no other than the old one, so also this dogma is no more than the truth, fulfilment and re-establishment of that old and first truth—Man the image and glory of God, God in man. But the *person of Christ* in its *individuality* makes here the difference between the truth and its fearful perversion in that revived doctrine of the abyss—Hegelianism, which recognises no God who became man

Hosted by Google

in time, but one who is eternally becoming man, which declares the whole of fallen humanity with its (denied) sin to be the Son of God, and calls *that* the glorification of God in man—but it is no other than the seditious Barabbas put in place of the Saviour.

Believe first *in God* (with Israel), and then, therefore, therein, *in Me!* Thus speaks the Lord afterwards, ch. xiv. 1. The so-called faith *in humanity* is reduced to confusion and put to scorn by *sin*. Where then, and in what son of man and child of Adam apart from Christ, does God receive the full tribute of His glory? No other man comes in his own prerogative to God, to the Father, than He who uttered Jno. xiv. 6. There is no other God and Father than He whom we behold in Christ, according to Jno. xiv. 9.

Finally, *how* and *where* do we attain to this *seeing?* We see not God in Christ as He sits in majesty at the right hand of the Father—our *looking up into heaven* after the manner of the men of Galilee (Acts i. 11) would remain without power and without result. It is said here, Jno. xiii. 33—Ye cannot at once come after and unto Me there! It is *on the cross* that we are to find Him first of all, there He is exalted for us, and thus the glorification of God in the Son of man is, *thirdly*, the *exhibition* or *offering* of God to entire humanity as the object of faith and love. Here love is manifested and offers itself to our faith, that we may be sanctified in love. The world is redeemed, and now goeth forth the word of reconciliation, and in it the Spirit. The heavenly glorification of the Son of man, in whom God was now already glorified, in God Himself, was to be self-understood, even as the Lord made it follow in ver. 32. And if the faith of the disciples had been perfect, they would have drawn the same conclusion themselves. We can now draw it *with them*, and say of the Crucified and Risen—It is the Lord, the Lord of glory! Nevertheless, this faith rests solely *upon*, and grows solely *out* of the fundamental truth,—God *was* in the propitiating suffering Christ. Here is not merely the kernel and centre, but actually all in One. Whatever in the opinions or even in the confessions of our faith does not essentially, livingly, inwardly hang together *with this*, is not fundamental to holiness and salvation; but *at the cross the distinction is made* between Christianity and pseudo-Christianity. Worshipping before the Crucified, and as

Hosted by Google

crucified to call Him our Lord and God—to this we are led by that fearing and seeking faith in God which must precede it; and all sincere seekers out of an old covenant cry here, each one at his hour, the final, blessed εὑρήκαμεν, before which the prejudices of every Nathanael give way. And the Crucified Himself meets them, in His word and Spirit, with the cry—I am He! Philip then no longer desires to see the Father in any other way; for here is God *before* us, God *with* us, God *for* us—and become God *in* us. Dost thou feel the serpent's bite, poor child of Adam? Here is the Lord thy Physician exalted in the form of the serpent! Behold Him; so hear the word from the cross that it may become to thee a seeing—in spite of all the sophistry which would bewitch thee not to obey the truth,—let this figure be painted before thine eyes! And who is the exhibitor of it? Who is the Glorifier of the glorified Christ both for our hearts and our minds? The Holy Ghost, who exhibits Him in the words of the Evangelists and in the apostolical preaching which to this day has never ceased. And what is the fruit of this glorification? A faith in Him who first loved, who becomes *love* in us; as the Lord will proceed to show further on in this chapter.

Ver. 32. After this extended exposition of the first verse, for the preaching tone of which we do not so much ask forgiveness as acceptance, there yet remain a few observations upon the following. The Lord speaks of a *twofold* glorification. He is, first of all, made perfect in obedience through suffering as the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας for the entire race of mankind; His dying becomes the ἀκμὴ of His divinely-loving and self-sacrificing life, and thus the *image of God in man* is once more restored, and exhibited to us. This honour of God in Him is His first and true honour, without which there would have been nothing to be said of any future honour, or indeed of any other. Yet there *follows* immediately from this, according, as it were, to the advancing revelation of His career—The Dying One rising again, and ascending to heaven—the *glorification of the Son of man in God.* This logical *deduction*, as it is drawn by our Lord's anticipatory trust, lies in the repetition of the former clause with εἰ, which will be regarded as "strange and gloss-like," or "feebly repeating" (Luthardt) only by such as miss its profound meaning in this

Hosted by Google

place. Its absence in many important authorities is to be explained either by that general lack of discernment as to the true meaning of the passage, or by resorting to ὁμοιοτέλευτον. The apparent tautology is quite in harmony with the character of the discourses which now begin, and which are full of such resuming deductions. B.-Crusius is perfectly right in saying (after Grotius), that this εἰ is *not* used hypothetically, but introduces the argument of an inference, being equivalent to *quandoquidem*. The kernel of that inference lies in the necessarily corresponding *recompense* which the Son sanctified for His own asks and receives from the Father, as it comes prominently forward in ch. xvii.—I have glorified Thee; and now glorify Thou Me! The fundamental principle of 1 Sam. ii. 30 (Sept. τοὺς δοξάζοντάς με δοξάσω), which Grotius adduces, finds here in fact its highest application, as Origen expressed it: ἀντιδωρεῖται αὐτῷ ὁ πατὴρ τὸ μεῖζον, οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πεποίηκεν. This μεῖζον lies as a μέγιστον in the ἐν ἑαυτῷ, for which indeed in ch. xvii. 5 παρὰ σεαυτῷ stands; yet that must be interpreted by this, and not conversely. "As by Him and in Him as the Son of man God was glorified, the glory of the Divine life stamped upon His life in the flesh, so now the Son of man, as the exhibitor of the new life-type, is by God, in His well-pleased recognition of His accomplished work of glorification, *taken up into His own Divine life and glory*." (Beck S. 610.) And there is a fine truth in the observation that Jesus first spoke "under the strong impulse of prophetical prolepsis, as if all was overcome already"—and then "as the high emotion sinks down again" He returns to the distinction καὶ εὐθύς δοξάσει. Yet Lücke, who makes this observation, guards against the misapprehension that on that account the concluding glorification is the same as the preceding. For it is not an "old misconception," but a scriptural truth, that here (as in ch. xii. 28) the discourse is of a twofold (though really the same) δοξάζειν. The εὐθύς, finally, does not mean to say that His death itself was to be this *second* glorification[1]—though this "Johannæan view" is generally appealed to with approbation; but immediately thereupon, *suddenly*, to the astonishment of the world and even of the disciples, His

[1] For which Lücke cites Euthymius, ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ σταυρῷ.

Hosted by Google

resurrection and glorification was to follow. Luthardt's protest against this exposition of mine finds but a poor justification in interpreting εὐθύς—with the *presently* beginning sufferings! The essential unity of the δοξάζειν, which I have by no means desired, does most manifestly resolve itself into a twofold glorification through the quick succession of the "death and resurrection," of the deepest abasement and the highest exaltation.[1]

Ver. 33. The Master, after these lofty words, which are too high for the weakness of the disciples, stoops not simply with a brotherly but with a fatherly love to His *children*. This is something quite different from the φίλοι of ch. xv. 15, yea, in a certain sense, is its opposite. The meaning of this expression, occurring only here in our Lord's lips,[2] is by no means exhausted by saying that "the tone of the departing Master becomes more tender and confidential." In its tenderness of affection the solemn truth must be discerned, that these weak disciples whom the Lord by anticipation calls friends, and draws upwards to Himself in love, and for their *future* understanding greets with the utterance of such high mysteries, are yet for the time no more than new-born babes, and far from the goal marked out in Eph. iv. 13. (Peter, ver. 37, would be a man before the time!) Therefore says He *now*, and for the *present*, to these His dear children, the same thing which He had twice before said (ch. vii. 34, viii. 21) to the unbelieving and opposing *Jews*,[3] though obviously in a different sense.[4] Whence we may take note, as

[1] Consequently, it harmonises well with a *twofold* glorification that "the receding emotion returned into the καὶ εὐθύς δοξάσει, which establishes the distinction," as Lücke's words obviously say—though Luthardt has not read them.

[2] For τέκνα, Mar. x. 24, is not altogether the same.

[3] Καὶ ὑμῖν λέγω ἄρτι is incorrectly referred by Luther to the following verse, the δίδωμι of which needed no preparatory λέγω.

[4] The ἄρτι appears to us not to look backwards, as Luthardt thinks, quoting Meyer with approval:—"He could not longer spare them this declaration," and Bengel: noluit discipulis citius hoc dicere, infidelibus dixit citius. But it is a limiting "*for the present*," which looks forward to His glory—as the Lord presently explains it Himself, ver. 36, by νῦν (Luth. für diesmal), which Peter substitutes for ἄρτι: see, moreover, ch. xiv. 3, xvi. 22, xvii. 24.

Hosted by Google

Olshausen observes, "that the Redeemer Himself takes pleasure in using the same sayings with diverse references." The two statements there uttered to the Jews—Ye shall *not find* Me, ye shall *die in your sins*, are necessarily wanting here. There was, assuredly, in these words of departure and severance—Whither I go *ye cannot come*, "something inexpressibly troubling," and "we must lose sight of the emphasis which Jesus places upon the *cannot*." (Dräseke.) He thereby, not merely returning back again down to His own in the world, but actually looking forward in prophecy, intimates that His glorifying assumption *to God* would partake the character, as for the world so also for His believers, of a *concealment* until the time of a final *revelation*. (Col. iii. 3, 4.) That the Son of man is glorified in God Himself, abides the hidden and high object and goal of *faith*. As we cannot with our bodies at once go up to heaven, so cannot we in our spiritual life become at once heavenly like Him; *therefore*, also, we cannot at once ascend in our knowledge and spiritual apprehension to Jesus. Even this does not yet *behold* His glory. All our dogmatic persuasion of faith concerning His sitting at the right hand of God would hence be without effect in drawing and purifying us to Himself, if He had not been first glorified *for us* in humiliation, upon the cross. Therefore the Lord speaks of a *seeking*, but in the case of His own of a seeking to which the promise of *finding* is given. The *heart* with its *love* seeks *the Crucified*, even where the faith of knowledge wavers or is yet unestablished; in that love is the genuine germ of faith, and thus seeking it findeth ever more and more the Risen and the Glorified. (St Mark xvi. 6.) Yea, the heart believes, perceives, and lives on into experience, through the influence of the love-awakening glorification of Him who suffered and died in love. *This* is the deep connection and transition in the discourse between ver. 33 and ver. 34, between the one dogma of the glorification of the Son of man and the one ἐντολή which points to love. We reach, indeed, love through faith; but through love alone we live ourselves (dying to the old life) into the fulness of faith. None of the learned expositors, as far as we know, has perceived this; it has entered the minds only of those practical expositors, who have read with their hearts and for their hearts. Dräseke: "Your desire after Me

Hosted by Google

is the main condition of our further fellowship. I am so long and so certainly yours, as ye seek Me with hearts full of love." Again, "With no other design did He place in the connection of our text this new commandment, than because He would say —*Love, little children, that ye may understand Me.* Love, that I may be able to glorify you in My glory."[1] Braune, too: "I am upon the Father's throne, but because visible tokens thereof fail, all is mystery to you and sometimes doubtful: I triumph, and sorrow oppresses you, the mighty tremble and their empire is passing away, but ye hide yourselves and are in dismay. *Yet is there a way to Myself open to you:* Love one another!" That is, In My love, from love to Me, because and as I have *loved* you.

Ver. 34. If the καινὴ διαθήκη, of which the sacramental institution speaks, refers to Ex. xxiv. 8, comp. Jer. xxxi. 31, so without doubt (and let this be a note of the bond of unity between St John and the Synoptics) the ἐντολὴ καινή stands in the strictest connection with this. For to a covenant belongs a law-giving.[2] Even here, where the beginning and the foundation of the covenant is the perfect self-sacrifice of the Lord for and in the sinner which must first take place, there must not be wanting some condition or obligation on the part of the sinners thus reconciled and sanctified. The old covenant was founded upon free prevenient grace in the call of Abraham, in the promised and fulfilled redemption of his seed (Ex. xix. 5), yet its proper consummation did not take place but in the sprinkling of the sacrificial blood *after* the commandments of Sinai (see Heb. ix. 19); so that it was a covenant of commandments. *Here* we cannot think otherwise than that the propitiating self-offering love has *previously* borne witness to itself in the Last Supper, before the ἐντολὴ καινή follows: and this gives us a forcible reason for not inserting its institution later. In any case, the close relation between the covenant and the new com-

[1] Predigten über die letzten Schicksale unsres Herrn, i. 214, and ii. 86.

[2] Yet both are not one and the same, *not* (according to Lange) that the appointment of the Sacrament is itself to be understood in the ἐντολὴ καινή; for this opposes all our previous exposition of this pregnant word. Not "a new institution," but every old precept of love is condensed into one new precept in Him, as St John's epistle has authentically expounded it.

Hosted by Google

mandment remains undeniable;[1] *from this* and from nothing else must we set out in solving the question (dealt with by most expositors with such unbelieving want of insight)—In what consists the *newness* of this precept.

We cannot here agree with the venerable v. Meyer, who elsewhere so often hits most acutely the meaning of Scripture. He begins rightly, "the true commandment of the New Testament," but then immediately goes astray, "in opposition to the ritual law and the pharisaic teaching, and even to the notions of the Apostles; newer than that of following Him (the most pre-eminent as long as He was upon earth); the newest among many, yea, the sole and distinctive law." The opposition to the precepts of the Pharisees, and to the notions of the Apostles still entangled more or less in them, has no application here, for it is the lawgiving on Sinai which is here the question; nor must we refer exclusively to the ritual law, since it is to the old covenant of the ten words to which the new covenant with its one word is opposed. And as to its opposition to the earlier precept (preliminary?) of following Christ, that is not simply superficial but altogether unfounded. This notion takes its origin from Bengel, who has been entirely misled here by his false harmony, so that his note sets out with this error: "This precept is called new, *not* so much with respect to the O. T., as in respect to the school of Christ!" He then says: "Previously the *following* of Jesus in His several steps had guided the disciples, and this implicitly included love; but they cannot follow Him now that He is departing from them, and therefore the sum of their duty is prescribed to them thus." For, is not the loving, because and as He has loved, yea the giving up of life for the brethren for His sake, itself the following of Christ, its essential development? Ver. 36. Did the Lord ever intend His previous commandment to follow Him, in any other sense?

We must, in order to understand the new commandment as *new*, ask solely and inquire what is the distinctive character of the *New Testament*, in as far as it also has a lawgiving. Now that is not to be found in love itself and of itself, nor in its *intenser*

[1] Bengel's Harmony, which transposes chaps. xiii. and xiv. to the Wednesday, dissolves this connection; and by that circumstance of itself is sufficiently refuted.

Hosted by Google

power, nor in its *restricting* concentration:—and thus we reject at once the most current interpretations. In his first Epistle, ch. ii. 7, 8, the Evangelist undeniably refers to this present utterance of our Lord as given in his own gospel, and furnishes the right commentary upon it. But we cannot, with most expositors, refer the ἀπ' ἀρχῆς in ver. 7 of that chapter simply to the beginning of Christianity; but we understand it unhesitatingly, with the ancients, that the commandment was the *old* commandment from the time of the old covenant and law. The λόγος, which they had heard from the beginning, is not merely the word and precept of Jesus as in vers. 3–5, but the meaning goes onwards by ἀπ' ἀρχῆς to say that this word of Jesus is identical with every word and commandment of God from the beginning. Mark, moreover, the explanation of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς in ch. iii. 11, 12, which goes back to the beginning of Scripture immediately after Adam's fall; and, again, that in ch. v. 2, 3 this love is referred to the ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ generally. Again, let the decisive antithesis in ch. ii. 8 be well noted, according to which the old commandment is made a new one coincidently with the outburst of the light after the darkness, that is, in connection with the New Testament grace in Christ. Thus, that we should love God first, and then for God's sake our neighbour, our brother, in God, is not a new thing in Israel:—this is attested by the tenor of the instruction and exhortation of the Deuteronomy, which spiritualises the decalogue, and *so far* points forward to its great fulfilment, though at the same time it gives thereby no other than its true meaning. Nor is it anything new in the world generally, so far as it knows φύσει and even performs τὰ τοῦ νόμου; for the world of heathenism speaks much about love.[1] Further, the newness and distinctiveness of the New-Testament precept of love cannot consist in the intenser degree of its self-sacrificing devotion—as Knapp supposes himself to have proved, Tholuck and Lücke following him; and as many of the ancients likewise held. It is specious but incorrect to say that in the

[1] Thus we do not agree with Sander's comment on the Epistles of St John, which treats most incorrectly the ἀπ' ἀρχῆς of this passage. Refutation of his errors would take us too far; but we may refer to the one point, that while in the *second* Epistle vers. 5, 6 apply the thought differently, this decides nothing for the first Epistle.

Hosted by Google

Old Testament the main element even of love is the principle of justice and equivalent, the *jus talionis*,—as I love myself and would be loved by my neighbour, so must I love him—while, in the New Testament the spirit and meaning of Christ goes far beyond this; man, as Cyril says, being required and enabled to love others *οὐχ ὡς ἑαυτὸν ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἑαυτόν* in which Euthymius concurs, as may be seen in Lücke. For, first, there is nothing in the word of Jesus about this especial intensification, but it rather adheres to the righteousness of the mutual *ἀλλήλους*; and, then, the whole notion of this distinction is oblique and unreal, as Olshausen properly though not fundamentally enough shows. "The true love, which is the nature of God Himself, is everywhere one and the same; it is not now *more* and then *less*." Yea, verily, *God's* precept even in the Old Testament knows and inculcates no other love than that which consists in unselfish devotion; and beyond *this* justice and holiness in the sight of God, beyond this perfect commandment, *there is no other and no greater*, as our Saviour's quotation of the old law, Mark xii. 31, expressly testifies. Would we place Christ in St Mark and Christ in St John in contradiction? The imperfection of the Old-Testament law does not lie in this, that it prescribes a lower degree of love and holiness (for there can be nothing higher than—Be ye holy as I am holy!), but in its confronting, imposing, legal character, without power for its fulfilment.

Least of all may we seek the newness of the commandment of Christ in the especial restriction or even concentration of love upon the narrow circle of the brethren united in the bonds of common devotion to Him. Grotius: Novum dicit, quia non agit de dilectione communii omnium—sed de speciali Christianorum inter se quâ tales sunt. Against which Tholuck protests, "How can that be called a new precept, when this *peculiar love* was not only admitted by the Jews, but by them carried to excess?" It is most strange to introduce here in the New Covenant, in which the Lord gives Himself for many, yea, for all, the partiality of love, even though based upon the spiritual brotherhood of His people. We shall see hereafter abundant evidence that, despite all appearances, He does not give so exclusive a meaning to His *φιλαδελφία*. Kölbing has lately, with

Hosted by Google

his Moravian honesty of intention, laboured strenuously for this superficial and current interpretation of our passage.[1] In all the discourse of this sacred evening, the Lord is "occupied especially with His disciples, and with their peculiar relations to Him and to one another." Quite true, but is He not also concerned with their testimony to the world, in order to the future progressive extension of this first circle of disciples? This alone would infer something very different from an exclusive limitation of love to the circle of believers at any time extant. Kölbing again protests vehemently against the evil that "now-a-days the love of our neighbour and brotherly love are regarded as one and the same, and as having precisely the same significance"—and declares that "in all ages, and especially in our own, it is highly important that the consciousness of the *distinction* between general love and brotherly love should be kept alive in the church." Quite right, in its degree and in its place; provided that a restricted brotherly love is not thereby made the essential and distinguishing characteristic of the *New Testament*, and asserted to be the proper meaning of our Lord's utterance on this occasion. In S. 689 we find a very suspicious misinterpretation of the New Testament name of brother, which the Lord in the Sermon on the Mount uses for every fellow-man (not merely for every fellow-Israelite!), just as St James ch. iv. 11 uses ἀδελφός for the πλησίον of the Old Testament law, in ch. ii. 8, referring it also in this chapter to the Gentiles who might enter into the assembly. By what token are we to know with certainty, in the midst of a Christian people all under the obligations and blessed with the grace of baptism, to whom we are altogether to refuse our especial brotherly love? And are our Missionary speakers wrong in speaking of love towards our poor *brethren* without, equally redeemed with ourselves? Then this restriction is in appearance only, and will not stand the test. Although assuredly the love which Christ less commands than brings, creates, and bestows, will have a hearth in which it may be properly said to be kindled, and from which it diffuses its warmth, in the especial fellowship of those who are to that end born again

[1] In which S. 686 we find also a great error as to the Old Testament and the relation to it of the Sermon on the Mount.

Hosted by Google

through Him, yet according to His spirit and His design this fellowship is not anything exclusive and shut in, but embraces with all the strength of united love the entire world, which is by this love to be won and redeemed from its sin. Thus we exhibit and extend, not independently of and in connection with, but *in and with* this brotherly love, that universal love which is therefore itself called generally and absolutely *ἀγάπη*. (2 Pet. i. 7.) If we are mutually to love one another, and that with an anticipating spontaneous self-offering love, which alone is true love, its extension to all follows of necessity—to those whom we yet know not, but who are our *future* brethren redeemed like ourselves by the Lord. Only then do we love, *as He hath loved us!* Or, did He actually give up His life *only* for His friends, as from Jno. xv. 13 has been most inappropriately urged? Could that which the Apostle testifies concerning the *love of enemies*, Rom. v. 6–10, from the death of Christ, yea of overcoming evil with good, ch. xii. 20, 21, even out of the Old Testament, surpass in any sense the meaning of Christ Himself? Let Matt. v. 47, 48, be pondered as His solemn word even for the narrowest, truest brotherhood of His kingdom! We gladly concur with Lücke: "Since the fellowship of the Divine kingdom embraces all that bears in it the seed and germ of the Divine life (better—that should receive), so the New Testament circle of love is the widest imaginable, in which the Jewish bigot-question has no place—Who is my neighbour (or even brother)? The restriction is only apparent, in reality it means the widest extension." Yes, verily, the fire of love must be concentrated upon the hearth of confirmed fellowship in Him, only that it may beam forth the more mightily upon all the world.

All this, then, not sufficing to approve itself the true interpretation of the *καινή*—what is its meaning? We regard it, pressing still from the external into the internal, as consisting, first, in the simplicity and plainness of the *expression*, as it respects the *form*—then, and pre-eminently, in the perfection of the new, now first existing *type*, in the *power of fulfilment* which flows from this *life-giving* type, which is more than a mere type—and, consequently, in the *abiding living newness* of this *ἐντολή*.

As all the dogmatics of the new teaching for faith was found

Hosted by Google

to coincide in that single expression, God in man, that is, in Christ—so is all the lawgiving of the New Covenant embraced simply and singly in that one word concerning love.[1] Thus did the veteran John represent it in his well-known word to the church of Ephesus; and in this there is assuredly an element of newness, in contradistinction to the many and yet vain commandments of the old covenant. The word of Christ and His Spirit does, indeed, resolve the obligation of love into its inexhaustible variety of duties; but this manifoldness could never *before* be at the same time *so clearly and plainly reduced back into one*—not in the intimation of Lev. xix. 18 (itself between individual precepts)—as it is in Matt. xxii., and Rom. xiii. 8–10.

Whence comes this? *Now* first is the knowledge and spiritual contemplation of what love is, possible through the glorification of the love of God in the Son of man, through that type which shines so brightly before us—*As I have loved you!* As no other son of man could say—God is glorified in me; so no man could say, before and apart from Christ,—Love as I have loved! in its full and perfect meaning. But this type and exemplar is not merely living, but *makes alive;* and that is the kernel and centre of the *newness* of the new covenant and commandment. In this —*As I!* we have the *first table* of the New Testament decalogue, out of which alone the second is deduced and fulfilled—the open and full realisation of that which in the Old Testament is only very dimly intimated in the added motive which accompanies the isolated precepts—כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָֹה, with at furthest אֱלֹהֶיךָ appended. The love of Christ awakens in us, brings and imparts to us, the love of gratitude in return, which then, as He needs us not Himself, turns to our brethren as He would have it. The first perfect fulfilment of the law in Christ, man like ourselves, stands *before us* as a living decalogue; but to our faith power comes from it *into ourselves* to love in like manner. (Eph. v. 1, 2.) That is, as Kölbing says, "the *new foundation* of the commandments, the union of His disciples with the Lord through His blood." The precept to bear our brothers' burdens in love (to wash their feet), is called in Gal. vi. 2, the *law of Christ,* first, because Christ did Himself bear all our burdens,

[1] To this pointed v. Meyer's note, given previously—Yea, the *sole* commandment.

Hosted by Google

then, because He requires the same of His disciples, and requires it because they *can* fulfil it. Here we must protest against the almost universal assumption of the expositors that the ἵνα in the second clause is to be transposed and to be construed properly before καθώς. We know that elsewhere ἵνα stands thus for ὅτι, especially after a οὗτος, αὕτη, τοῦτο (comp. ch. xvii. 2, 3); and the words *might* literally run—ἐντολὴν ταύτην, ὅτι ἀγαπᾶτε, once more, ὅτι καθὼς ἐγὼ καὶ ὑμεῖς κ.τ.λ.[1] But the *matter* which is here spoken of teaches us that actually in this unjustifiably overlooked and invalidated ἵνα we have the kernel and key of the whole, the inmost and most essential καινότης πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότης γράμματος. Luther's translation "*auf dass*" is perfectly right, the restitution of which I unhappily failed to plead for. Christ hath loved us—*so that* and *in order that* we *may have power* to love likewise. (See the same ἵνα, Rom. vi. 4, where the amended translation has markedly put *mögen* instead of *sollen*). Let it not be said, as Alford affirms in opposition to me, that the second ἵνα is parallel with the first and to be explained by it; rather must the first be explained by the second; and the δίδωμι, in the New Testament spirit, should have this full meaning,—Here it is an ἐντολή of what *should be* simply that is spoken of, but the Lord *gives* His living and life-giving commandment to His own, *as* He gives His peace and His Spirit—as the *Father gave to Him* the ἐντολή of His doctrine, life, and death.

The precept of the *old covenant*, although it signifies the same love, stands nevertheless and continues to stand on tables of stone, in the Torah; to fulfil it, at least as perfectly as through the Spirit of Christ, remains an impossibility. Certainly it is so in the natural heart of the *old man*—there stands the love-commandment miserably *reversed* in selfishness, Every man must love me![2] And the Old Testament, the expression of which the Lord repeated in the Sermon on the Mount can at first only point *condemningly* to this pattern; it can only demand the reversal of natural self-love into the now supernatural *self-denial*—but not produce it. For, apart from grace, that is a fearful truth which even Hezel remarks upon our text—"To nothing

[1] As modern translations simply give it, So love—so should ye also love.

[2] Compare our observations at the Sermon on the Mount, vol. i.

Hosted by Google

is man more inclined than to hatred of man!" It is true that there was genuine love in the Old Testament, but not created by its law. There were before Christ, there are now apparently out of Christ, Samaritans, who practise mercy, but only through prevenient hidden grace in Christ. And where Christ is preached, there first is all love made perfect by His Spirit; while all so-called love, which will not accept but declines Him, must be reduced to a *lie*. As Nitzsch preaches, "At this point we must cry to the Spirit of truth that He convince the world and the spirit of the age of its glorification of love in connection with a contempt of faith. What, is love to be exalted alone, and faith to become a thing of nought? Just because so very much, yea, everything depends at last upon love, on that very account we should lay great stress upon the genuine and pure teaching of evangelical faith, and make very much, yea everything, depend upon the unmutilated truth of redemption and of grace in Christ in all its unimpaired and perfect revelation of the grace and love of God in Christ." Even as he lays out the plan of his excellent sermon:—"In communion the great essential is brotherly love; in brotherly love, if it is to flourish perfectly, the great essential is the Lord's discipleship."[1] *When the darkness is past and the true light now shineth, then* is the ἐντολὴ a καινὴ, that is, an ἀληθὲς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν. (1 Jno. ii. 8.) There have we the authentic interpretation of the Evangelist himself! Then have we passed from death unto life

[1] Schonaich, das neue Gebot des Evangeliums, Magdeb. 1846, has set in an excellent light this passage as it has been perverted by the German Catholics. He gently reminds these erring ones that "they are building without laying a foundation; that they seek fruit without planting the tree." And its conclusion testifies, "We will never agree with the melancholy fancy that nothing depends upon faith, but will evermore assert that this is the root and living fountain of love." In the denial of faith as the foundation the error lies, and not in the interchanging and confounding brotherly love and universal love! To this applies what Kahnis has well said (vom. h. Geiste i. 5): "Though the Lord makes love the distinguishing note of His disciples, it does not follow that Christianity consists only in love. The measure of subjective appropriation is not the measure of the thing itself. A man very eminent in the learning of this world wrote to a pious Christian lady the commonplace remark that—to him Christianity was love; she replied, Yes, but according to St John's word in his Epistle, 1 Jno. iv. 10.

Hosted by Google

(ch. iii. 14). Therefore is it God's commandment that we *believe* on the name of His Son Jesus Christ, and *love* one another, as He *gave* it to us in His commandment (ch. iii. 23). There have we the unity of faith and love, the growing of love out of faith! "No man is in a condition truly in the Spirit of Christ to love his neighbour as himself (we would add—and in the truth of the old commandment, from the beginning) unless he loves *like Christ*." (Lücke.) And no man, again, can attain to this unless as a disciple of Christ he hath *received* His Spirit.

Thus the *new type and exemplar* with its *new power* is the fundamental point in the newness. But as we at first, when referring to that subject, admitted something of newness in the simplicity of the word which enjoins it, so we may now supplement all by adding—This word *becomes to us abidingly new* as a superaboundingly exciting principle, convincing us of an obligation never discharged but ever in force (Rom. xiii. 8), a universal ἐντολή prompting to eternally new duty, reigning over that boundless domain—εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή. But this *last* view of it, which can be understood only when the others are understood, must not be made, with Olshausen, the only meaning of the ἐντολὴν καινήν: to do so is strange folly, to be accounted for only by the expositor's confusion of ideas in the interpretation of the whole passage.

Ver. 35. In this following verse our whole exposition finds its full justification and completion. So much of obligation and of absolute condition remains in this evangelical precept, that whosoever does *not* fulfil it is thereby necessarily excluded from the covenant of grace. In test, consequently, and warning, the Lord now marks out the *boundaries* of discipleship, just as the Sermon on the Mount pointed its close, though here more graciously in the positive form of expression. But while He speaks in the positive form, the rigid negation must be heard as the undertone,—If ye should *not* have this love, it would be thereby evident that ye are *not* My disciples. This is involved in the critical ἐάν. In this one thing and in no other is discipleship approved. It is not *knowledge* which avails, not a *so-called faith*, even though like that of Judas, before the devil entered him, it could cast out devils and remove mountains; rather is this knowledge and this genuine faith known by this love. As

Hosted by Google

little avails the *confession* of My name, or of all the truth concerning My person and My kingdom. Where this walking in the truth is not found, the confession becomes an all the more frightful lie. Where Christians are disputing over the holy places, in the presence of Turks and Heathens, to the reproach of their Lord, contending whether Latins or Greeks are His true disciples—when the Formula Concordiæ is made an apple of discord among brethren—the world may well ask what their Master has taught or done for them. As the disciples of the Pharisees were known by their phylacteries, and as the disciples of John were known by their fasting, and every school by its shibboleth—the mark of the disciples of Christ is to be *love*. And that a genuine love, as Christ loveth; not that merely which (as Schonaich represents) says to a neighbour—Thy joy is my joy, thy pain is my pain—which, indeed, is a great thing, and not to be found in reality in the world—but that which recognises and aims at the salvation of a neighbour, his true good; which makes the joy of the sinner its grief, and his divinely mourning sorrow its joy, and says, *Thy salvation is my joy, thy destruction is my grief!* It is still possible for the world to *recognise* at least this love, through the Spirit of Christ who accompanies and bears witness to His grace. Love itself is not to be seen with the eyes, but the light of its good works is (Matt. v. 16); and it is a well-grounded presupposition that *all men* in the world know enough about love to discern and distinguish generally that which approves itself as genuine by active endeavours for the good and salvation of others.

Let it be observed, further, that the Lord here says generally μαθηταί, for primarily and essentially the Apostles, like all others, are simple disciples. Thus does He significantly enlarge the circle for which He speaks, beholding in these eleven His whole people hereafter to be called, whom the covenant and the commandment concern:—the ἀλλήλους and ἐν ἀλλήλοις is said to all future μαθηταῖς, including with all who at any time exist those who are to follow them. And now comes in the γνώσονται πάντες in its widest extensiveness! *What* are all these, whose knowledge the Lord here foresees and promises, to discern in us? That we love one another warmly and intensely within our own narrow circle, but care nothing for *them* as they are

Hosted by Google

without and not brethren, or even love them *less?* How *can* they be certainly and convincingly assured of our love, otherwise than by finding it going out also towards *themselves?* Thus we have manifestly once more the presupposed and included universal love within the brotherly love! For *why* and *to what end* are those without, so far as they can and will perceive it, to note and learn from us what true discipleship is? "Why is the Lord so solicitous that His disciples should be discerned and known of every man? For their own reputation in the eyes of man? But not merely, on the other hand, that they may be persecuted and hated, while they are *acknowledged.* No, they are to be recognisable and make themselves known, in order that others may be taught to believe in the Father of glory and the Redeemer, and glorify Him who has given unto men such power to love. *Thus it follows of itself,* that in loving one another, *they only exercise and prepare themselves for the exercise of a love which is to go beyond into all the world*" (Nitzsch). The others should thereby learn to believe and love, to become disciples, because they have been themselves loved as future and possible disciples. Let ch. xvii. 20, 21, 26 be compared and searchingly examined, for it essentially belongs to our present subject. In order that Christ's disciples may be able to love the world with a united love, we say once more with Nitzsch, "their love must have a household hearth on which its fire may be nourished, in which it may first condense its vigour."[1] This is our Lord's teaching—"but no exclusiveness as it regards those who are to be disciples, though now unrecognised as such."

Finally, the πάντες, closely investigated, does not refer merely and solely to those without; but the general expression, connected with what precedes and follows, intimates likewise that in *every* respect ἐν τούτῳ alone is the γνώρισμα of the μαθηταί to be found. Among themselves, also, are they to be known and approved by this; every man must know solely from this that he himself is in Christ (1 Jno. ii. 5);—yea, lastly, as Matt. vii. 16–23 indicates by what marks the Lord will in the last day know His own, so we are to interpret this passage too.

[1] Compare also his Prakt. Theologie i. S. 248, where the distinctive obligations of brotherly love have also justice done to them.

Hosted by Google

And it is to this that the unusual ἐμοὶ μαθηταί (as mei or mihi) seems to point:—In My sight and judgment, or to My honour (as ch. xv. 8), so that I may be able to acknowledge you.

THE FIRST INTIMATION OF PETER'S DENIAL.

Ch. xiii. 36, 38 [Luke xxii. 34].)

This pre-intimation of Peter's denial is manifestly not the same with that second which Matt. xxvi. 34 and Mark xiv. 30 record as given after the setting out, *on the way to Gethsemane;* but St John's narrative may be harmonised with that of St Luke. It may be regarded as strange that Peter should the second time be so presumptuous as to enforce from the Lord a second prediction of his denial—but we have a parallel in the twofold indication of the traitor, and the evangelical records cannot otherwise be understood. For our part, we think it better to accept such *repetitions*, which are not the less perfectly reconcilable because they are such, than with the *identifying* Harmony to deal loosely with the most definite statements of time and connection.

Here in St John Peter has almost overlooked the great word concerning love, into which John himself profoundly sunk, because his rash curiosity is still busy with the ὑπάγειν of ver. 33. He thinks of *that* alone, and reverts to it in his question. This is a point of connection which has its historical value; and it is not necessarily a different one from that of Lu. xxii., since the Lord's words there introduced, ver. 31, 32, without any immediate connecting clause, may well be regarded as interjected between. St John is generally, as we know, more exact in his systematic treatment than St Luke; and he shows us here how that the Lord was induced, after the dogmatic word for the apprehension of faith, vers. 31–33, and the ethical word for the love of the heart, vers. 34, 35, to add yet a *third* word—in opposition to the presumptuous *curiosity* of the head and the heart, for the casting down of all the precipitancy of nature. The open and hasty Peter, who shows himself always as he is—*in that* being also a Nathanael—is the representative, in this

Hosted by Google

chapter of general significance, of that impetuous curiosity which springs from a lack of self-knowledge and self-communion:—that twofold evil which first takes the form of a misdirected questioning as to the Whither, and then of the bold self-confidence which merely follows it. The true inquiry and investigation, as the Lord teaches it, goes into one's own heart —Lord, is it I? *What am I?* He who pretermits or passes lightly over this, comes easily to *pass over* and forget, as if it were the *old* long-known word, Jesus' *new commandment* of love. Instead of perceiving *in this* the true way of following Christ for himself,—a way simple and plain, though to his high-minded and self-seeking nature so difficult and steep,—his desire is fixed solely upon this, to ask, out of what might appear to be a feeling of love, more about the Lord's ποῦ and ποῖ than He sees good to reveal.

Ver. 36. The answer gives at first, referring it especially to Peter, only a repetition of the declaration in ver. 33, which must stand. But for its closer explanation the previous overlooked ἄρτι is placed more prominently in its true position:—I have said to you all, and especially to thee, *for the present*, that ye *cannot* yet, νῦν, at this time, follow Me. The fault and the deficiency thus lies with the disciples, who are not yet mature and capable of dying with their Lord the self-renouncing death of love unto heavenly glorification. Indeed, they were all called to follow Him in their time, essentially by a very gradual increase of His life in themselves, but also in their own peculiar vocation to a similar self-sacrifice in martyrdom. Therefore, the νῦν is at once explained and complemented by an antithetical ὕστερον, parallel with the μετὰ ταῦτα of ver. 7, though manifestly with a more distant and wider meaning now. Peter is once more pointed to a *future experience*, to a *following under the Cross*. This following is for Peter especially the *death of martyrdom* ordained for him, as chap. xxi. 18, 19 proves; but it is at the same time for him as for all the whole internal experience of spiritual life, the *death of self-renunciation* which embraces the whole external process of life. The former has ever in the latter its root and its reality. Therewith perfectly coincides the general reference to his future experience, to his future apostolical power after the ἐπιστρέφειν, Lu. xxii. 32. As long as Peter

Hosted by Google

still tarries in rash curiosity he does not receive all this instruction; but afterwards, deeply humbled by his fall, he finds in that promise of his faithful Lord—*ἀκολουθήσεις μοι*, a *word of consolation* which establishes him again, as v. Gerlach well observes.

Peter, however, for the time overlooks all this, because his proud heart cannot yet *understand* it; he still occupies himself with the altogether too repugnant *οὐ δύνασαι*. He will not receive this saying, even from his Master and Lord, who knows assuredly much better than himself. He thinks that he knows himself; the forwardness of the *heart*, which properly lies at the foundation of that of the head, breaks out now in his not merely asking again *why*, but adding his strong protestations likewise. The second clause thus gives the first a deeper meaning: I cannot understand this, I know otherwise—*wherefore should I not be able?* Thus he utters his *Δύναμαι* like the sons of Zebedee their *Δυνάμεθα*, Matt. xx. 22. We see that he is still the same, after the Supper, as he was at the feet-washing.

Ver. 38. Mournfully, convictingly, and yet graciously does the Lord now address to him the testing question, uttered this time in vain, in which his *θήσω* is literally thrown back to him. With such a *θήσω*, such a *ἕτοιμός εἰμι* (Lu. xxii. 33), all is far from being done! Augustine cries out, Quid festinas, Petre? Nondum te suo spiritu solidavit Petra. First must *the Lord for thee lay down His life*, then comes the time of following Him. Dräseke well expresses the universal meaning which underlies this, and to which we have referred before,—"I will lay down my life for Thee—*in this he hit the very point*, expressing it sharply, definitely, and with a compass and force never before reached. Well, is the Lord's reply (at least this is in the great question by which He responds to the question of the disciple), *that is everything*. Nothing less than *the being able to lay down life for My sake* will avail if you would follow Me through this world. He who does not take up his cross and so follow Me, is not worthy of Me. *But—Hast thou reached this point?*"—If we may unite the records, it might be here that our Lord continued, after this question:—Simon, Simon, bethink thyself who thou art, and how it stands with you all—Satan hath desired to have you; and Peter more vigorously replied—With

Hosted by Google

thee, both into prison and to death—Lu. xxii. 34 here coinciding with Jno. xiii. 38.[1] As it regards the definite "deny Me *thrice*," and the significance of the *cock* crowing, we must defer what we have to say to the last part of our work, where, after having extracted what is peculiar to St John, we shall return to a comprehensive exposition. Let it be remarked only, that here *οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνήσει* is to be strictly referred to *this* night (introduced at ver. 30); and, therefore, that this must be the night between Thursday and Friday, since otherwise many crowings would have intervened. The *twice* crowing of Mark xiv. 30 will find its explanation in the sequel

FAREWELL DISCOURSES OF JESUS TO HIS DISCIPLES UNTIL HIS SETTING OUT.

(Ch. xiv. 1–31.)

Before we enter upon the detailed exposition of that inseparable whole which flows forth so richly and so profoundly between *μὴ ταρασσέσθω ἡ καρδία*, ch. xiv. 1, and *ἐγὼ νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον*, ch. xvi. 33, it is necessary, or we may be allowed, to say some preparatory words about the sections, and turning-points, and fundamental thoughts which mark the progress of this marvellous current of discourse. For exegesis can scarcely begin its task before such adjustment of the main ideas is made. We find, indeed, in this section, which on that account admits of no comparison with any other in Scripture, a peculiar difficulty of analysis; Vinet, commencing in his last days a series of lectures upon it, found—"*a Divine confusion*." For, what the departing Saviour here poured forth for future remembrance and glorification by the Spirit, remains still inexhaustible for our poor understandings, and far transcends the common laws of our so-called logical order of thought. Where the consolations, disclosures, predictions, and promises of the God-man for those

[1] It has been incorrectly said that Peter's denial was predicted by the Lord three times—here, in Luke, and in Matthew and Mark. But it appears more proper and more significant to say that *Peter* thrice protests against it.

Hosted by Google

whom He calls His friends, pulsate in the vibrations of His feeling (deeply-moved, but in the most serene self-consciousness), there the life is from moment to moment—one thing recurs ever in all, and yet every utterance is fresh, distinctive, and new. Thus the best advised course for the expositor is to enter and go through the whole discourse, as it proceeds sentence after sentence. But when he has done this, he may be allowed to gird and qualify himself for the proper business of an expositor, by unbiassed contemplation and observations upon the whole. In this spirit let the reader now mark what we have diffidently ventured to set forth.

It will appear undeniable that in ch. xiii. 31–35 we have, so to speak, the great theme of the following discourses marked out beforehand. We find here the three fundamental elements which pervade the whole:—the word concerning God's glorification in the Son for *faith*, the new commandment of *love*, the mysterious fore-announcement of *His departure*, who already taking His farewell requires faith and love, the Spirit for the full creation of which He goes to procure. Therefore we find interpenetrating these three fundamental thoughts, the perpetual *promise of the Comforter*, reference to His coming again with the light of truth, the life of love, the peace of victory.[1] It will appear, however, on a close investigation, that chs. xiv., xv., xvi., notwithstanding the constant recurrence of the same living thoughts which pulsate through them, do resolve themselves into *three corresponding masses*, which (though with some indistinctness between chs. xv. and xvi.) the present arrangement of the chapters represents. The *first* manifestly sets out from *faith* in God pre-eminently; the *second* relates especially to the *love* of those who are united with Him and through Him; the *third* comes in conclusively (we might say, for *hope*) with the most definite fore-announcement of all that which should result from, and follow upon, the *departure of Jesus*.[2] And now we may be permitted to point this out more closely.

[1] The accompaniment of *warning* is to be found only in one place, ch. xv. 2, 5, 6.

[2] With this almost entirely accords Baum.-Crusius' arrangement, unusually good for him:—"Ch. xiv. is spoken with more direct reference to the *consolation* of the disciples *immediately* after His departure; ch. xv. is

Hosted by Google

Thus, in ch. xiv., the Lord speaks *pre-eminently* concerning *faith* towards God and towards Himself, in the acknowledgment that the Father is in Him and He in the Father. (See vers. 1, 9, 10, 13, 20, 24.) Yet here we find that the Lord proceeds already from His own *departure*, that is, preparatorily for them to the Father; even as He anticipates the *love* in internal fellowship with Him, which exists in them as a germ through the weak beginning of their faith, but which was to be brought to its consummation through the influence of the *Comforter* to be obtained by His departure. Accordingly we find the same trichotomy underlying the whole:—

I. Faith in Him, who goes before through death into the Father's house,—that is, through death viewed in connection with its results, His heavenly exaltation and glorification.

1. Ye well *know whither I go!* (Vers. 1–4.) (although ye now cannot follow Me, as said before.)
2. Against the protesting interruption (ver. 5), the expression is changed: Not so much My death is *the way*, as rather, *I Myself* am the way, because the Father is in Me, and I am in the Father, because I thus dying *only go to the Father*, and again I *alone* (for you) can go to Him! (Vers. 6–10.) (Exposition of ch. xiii. 31, 32.)

II. *Love* in and out of faith, or the internal fellowship with the departing Lord, which begins with the faith now existing in them, but can be perfectly wrought only by the *Comforter*, whom He will send in His own place, in whom He Himself (with the Father) will come back to them.

1. First comes an *excitement of faith* through the sublime promise of *greater works* (vers. 11, 12), and perfect *answer of prayer* (vers. 13, 14).
2. *Then* the keeping of all His commandments in the one commandment of *love*. Here again,
   a. First, the preparatory word embracing them all in one.
   b. Then, the reference to the *Comforter* (prayed for by Himself) who will bring the new life, uniting them with Him

more *hortatory*, with respect to their continuous brotherly fellowship; ch. xvi. is more *warning* in its character, for *distant futurity*." But we would say, instead of *warning* for the last (not its main character!), more *comprehensive* and conclusive.

Hosted by Google

and the Father—and that, *because* faith and love are already in them (differently from the world), and also *to the end that* both may be made perfect in them. (Vers. 16–21.) Conclusion: I will manifest Myself!

c. The interjected question (ver. 22) concerning this difference between them and the world leads to a more direct explanation, which conditions the receiving of the Spirit (who will guide the knowledge of faith into all the truth) upon the *loving* obedience to His words. (Vers. 22–24.) (Exposition of what we found in ch. xiii. 34, 35.)

III. Returning back to the beginning, and now more plainly:—The Lord's *departure*, in which He

1. *Promises* in His prediction *peace*, or leaves it for His *farewell*. (Vers. 25–27.)
2. But, properly (speaking by anticipation for their future joy and their future faith), He *obtains* it by overcoming the prince of this world. (Vers. 28–31.) Here there is a first conclusion and setting forth in the *Let us go hence*—but this is again delayed, for the stream of discourse begins again to flow more deeply, and with still more fulness from His heart. He cannot yet leave His own, He has yet so much to say unto them.

Ch. xv. 1 down to ch. xvi. 4 treats, therefore, specifically of the *bond of love* between Him and them, as also, in consequence, among themselves: see vers. 9, 10, 12, 13, 17. But this also (just as in ch. xiv. the *world* already appears, in which He *leaves* His disciples) is led back again, through the contrast with the *hatred of the world*, into the promise of the *Comforter* after His *departure*.

I. His disciples' *bond of love* in Him (not without reference to the ordained Sacrament):

1. In the *similitude* of the Vine and its branches, pointing to the fruit of holy life as to be borne *only* through union with Him. (Vers. 1–6.) (Hence there is an accompanying warning to those who simply abide not in Him!)
2. Exposition of this in unfigurative terms. (Vers. 7–17.) (Confirming our interpretation in ch. xiii., that our love comes only from His.)

II. The ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους directs His thought anew to the

Hosted by Google

hatred of the still *unbelieving* world, in which they must *follow* Him who loved, but was hated; so that this becomes a second *note of His disciples.*

1. The warning announcement—It will not, it cannot go better with you than with Me! (Vers. 18–20.)
2. The explanation arising out of this:—the inexcusable sin of *unbelief!* (Vers. 21–25.) (So that here too, in this intermediate section, *faith* is *per oppositum* spoken of still.)

III. But, for their encouragement and peace, the Lord returns to the promise of the *Comforter* after His own *departure.*

1. Ye shall (in My love despite all the enmity of the world) *testify of Me,* as having been Mine from the beginning, when the Comforter is come! (Vers. 26, 27.)
2. All this *I say unto you beforehand* (as guard against offence and apostasy) because *I go from you.* (Ch. xvi. 1–4.)

To this is now joined the final and distinctive *farewell discourse,* which ch. xvi. 5–33 embraces. Here is most plainly and decisively announced, although in repetition of what had been previously said,—*all that was to follow after and from His departure,* and in such a manner that all is seen to rest upon the fundamental distinction between the *unbelief* of the world and their *faith* through the operation of the Comforter. First comes the definite *Νῦν ὑπάγω,* ver. 5, with the consolatory assurance that only in consequence of that the Comforter can come. (Vers. 6, 7.) The process of the discourse which follows is mainly directed to the *future,* but returns at the close to the present.

I. *The work and office of the Comforter,* when He shall come.

1. To the *unbelieving world,* vers. 8–11 (in which a direction to righteousness in Jesus follows necessarily upon the correction of its unbelief; and then also the escaping of judgment, through faith).
2. *To His disciples,* that they in faith may know all the truth, may understand the words of Jesus, that *He in them* (as the Father in Him) *may be glorified!* vers. 12–15. (Intenser expression for ch. xiii. 31, yet only the full explanation of what is involved there.)

II. The *great change from sorrow to joy* following *immediately* upon His departure,—as it awaits His first disciples, but only

Hosted by Google

as the type of all future disciples during the entire period between His departure and return.[1]

1. The wholesome *sorrow* (upon their being reduced to their own weakness and feeling their own sinfulness), which is turned into joy, and has for its fruit the true birth of the new man. (Vers. 16–21.)
2. Then and thenceforward increasing, and at the *last* goal of His *return* (of which the first return is once more only a type)—in that day full and perfect *joy!* (Vers. 22–24.)

III. *Concluding reference to the future*, final promise and comment upon all these farewell discourses:—My present discourse, even the plainest, remains uncomprehended by you for a while, as in proverbs, because your *faith* is not yet discerning and confirmed, and your love (with all its sincerity) is not yet strong and stedfast.

1. *In the future* ye shall plainly know (and, indeed, immediately the Father's love!)—because ye do yet *love* Me and *believe* in Me to some extent. (Vers. 25–28.)
2. *At present* I can acknowledge and confirm your faith (which ye avow, as ye think, with full understanding, together with the love which it testifies); yet only in connection with a lamenting glance at your weakness, which will be seen when the hour comes which is already come. (Vers. 31, 32.) (Here we have preparatorily the true meaning of the ἄρτι πιστεύετε, which coincides with ch. xiv. 1.)
3. Here, finally, *the Lord abruptly breaks off* with a *last word of consolation* concerning peace and *His overcoming the world*, ver. 33, a word which rises gloriously above all the weakness of His present and future disciples. And this θαρσεῖτε, νενίκηκα, anticipated through His confidence and in His love, can be followed by nothing else than the prayer of victory offered up in their hearing and before their eyes.

[1] Yet the sorrow of the first disciples (to anticipate our special exegesis) is based upon their still existing unbelief, which must become manifest; and is thus parallel with that Divine mourning by means of which the previously disciplining Comforter wins other disciples from the world.

Hosted by Google

FAITH IN GOD AND IN JESUS. HIS GOING BEFORE INTO THE FATHER'S HOUSE: HIMSELF THE WAY: THE FATHER IN HIM AS HE IN THE FATHER.

(Ch. xiv. 1–10.)

The clause which was probably interpolated for ecclesiastical reading—*καὶ εἶπε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ*, did not belong to St John's original text, which makes the discourse of our Lord to the collective disciples flow on continuously after the pre-intimation of the denial. The pressure of time and of His emotion would not allow the intervening pause to be of long duration.—"The humbled Peter is speechless"—but the Lord, whose purpose is to re-establish and console, begins now first to utter what was in His meaning and upon His heart when that forwardness had again interrupted Him. It was His design to speak of the *ὅπου ὑπάγω*, and, in connection with that, of the faith which should behold the glory of God in Him, of the love which should be begotten by His love. Thus He now gives a further answer to the *ποῦ ὑπάγεις*—yea, a superabounding answer to all the questions which then or thenceforward the heart and mind of His disciples might put forth, far beyond what either they or ourselves may ever understand. "He has here richly poured out all that high heartfelt *consolation* which Christianity has in it, or which man, in all his needs and troubles, can desire. Further, we have here the great articles of Christian doctrine in most impressive exhibition, fundamentally established as in hardly another place of Scripture:—the three undivided persons of the Trinity; the person of the Lord Christ in His human and His Divine nature, one and eternally inseparable; also the righteousness of faith, and the true comfort of man's conscience."[1]

Ver. 1. We read earlier concerning the Lord Himself, *ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι—ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι—ἡ ψυχή μου τετάρακται*. The *ταράσσεσθαι* of the *καρδία* here is not

[1] Luther's Vorrede zu seiner Auslegung von ch. xiv.–xvii. which "testimony to the glory of Jesus Christ" has been very seasonably re-edited by Hermes, Magdeburgh, 1846.

Hosted by Google

so deep as the first, but more than the second; this last word is found in prophetical reference to the sufferings of Christ, but could not be used in the more exact phraseology of the New Testament concerning Him. (Matt. xi. 29 is the only passage in the Evangelists which speaks of the *καρδία* of Jesus.) The Redeemer, now standing after the departure of the traitor in a prolepsis of His glorification, and thereby armed for His conflict, knows now not merely the distress which is in His disciples' hearts, but the anguish and perplexity which would shortly seize them:—His gracious *μὴ ταρασσέσθω*, spoken for the future, embraces both. They are now confounded and amazed by His words concerning His going away (ch. xvi. 6), and concerning the betrayal of one and the denial of another of His disciples; yea, the institution of the Supper, which should hereafter be their chiefest consolation, but the "for you" of which did not as yet find pure believing hearts, adds to their grief. And how often both to them and all future disciples would fear return to the heart, induced by all kinds of causes—the feeling of sin excited by the law, of weakness by the gospel, the conflicts and ways of trial in which they find themselves alone, down to the terror of death at the last hour! But against all this, *faith* is the armour and the consolation, nothing but faith, and therefore the Lord speaks alone of that. Luther says, "This is certain and can never fail; if a man is in trouble and his heart is weak and terrified, that comes not of Christ: for He is not the Man who would terrify His people's hearts, or make them mourn." He adds what saves this from being misunderstood, "For if Christ troubles any one for his repentance and conversion from a sinful life—that is not for long. He does not mean that thou shouldst continue in sorrow, but soon leads thee into His comfort again."

Have we then here in the redoubled *πιστεύετε* which was spoken for their consolation, an indicative or an imperative, or both? From the very beginning different views have been held upon this question. Luther not only translates two indicatives, following the Vulg. (and probably Chrys.), but bound the second with the first as its consequence:—Ye believe in God (ye already believe certainly in God, now), ye therefore also believe in Me! This is assuredly incorrect, for such faith in Jesus

Hosted by Google

as He meant was wanting to the disciples; and, moreover, the deduction of this faith from a general faith in God, as something already existing in consequence, is *here* at least out of place. Assuredly, it must essentially so follow, and if the faith in God (Mark xi. 22) is perfect, it is enough, and includes necessarily faith in the final and full revelation of God in Christ. For, all faith in God derived from an old covenant, finds Him only in Christ as *our* God—even as the same God directly reveals Himself to the heathens through Christ, according to that already-quoted conclusion of the great heathen in Christendom, John Paul, who on the threshold of truth says, "were there no God and no Providence, Christ were He." In as far as any man (like the same John Paul) denies his faith to the Christ come and preached, he is wanting also in true faith in God.[1] He who can reject Christ is fallen from God; but he who believes in Christ believes now first rightly in Him who sent Christ; consequently it would be right to say—Believe in Me, and then ye believe in God! But on that very account the Saviour could not attribute to His disciples *now* a perfect πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν θεόν; or prove to them from that that they sufficiently believed already in Himself. "The Saviour foresaw that men would be disposed to stand upon this, that faith in God was sufficient unto salvation: He therefore added—Believe in Me!" (Gossner.)

This not only refutes the view of Luther's translation, which torn from its connection is liable to sad perversion, but also that intermediate view, which Luther strangely substituted in his exposition,—that the first *believe* is indicative, the second imperative. So Erasmus and Beza; so Glassius and Grotius: *sicut* in Deum creditis, sic in Me quoque credite! (For which sicut *subaudiendum* the latter very inappropriately compares ver. 19 and ch. v. 17, while the former thinks that in the second πιστεύειν a verbum de continuatione rei significatæ intelligendum: Creditis in Deum, et in me credite, h. e. pergite credere.)

[1] "Many men *imagine* they can believe in God without being obliged to believe in Jesus. I have never met with a man who did. (That is, in Christendom, and rightly understood.) There are *liars* enough who say—I believe in God and have no need of Jesus." Hamburgher Friedensboten, Jahrg. 1821. S. 355. Yea, verily, for how can he who believeth not in Him whom he hath seen, believe on Him whom he hath not seen?

Hosted by Google

So also, unhappily, it stands in the London Hebrew N. T. מַאֲמִינִים—הַאֲמִינוּ. For this Olshausen also decides, "ye believe in God, therefore believe also in Me!" The possibility of such a meaning lies in the truth that the disciples did indeed believe already in God, and that the Saviour demanded of them that they should gather up all their Israelite faith towards God into a faith also in Himself. But did they not already in an imperfect sense believe also in Jesus? As He cannot recognise this latter as insufficient by a second indicative,[1] so He cannot use the first πιστεύειν in a less emphatic meaning than the second. Not *merely* were they to gather up their already existing faith in God, but they were to *consummate* it first by faith in Christ. Suffice it, that even for the meaning which would make Him *appeal* to all that they yet had of faith in God and Jesus, a *redoubled positive imperative* is alone suitable,—being opposed to the previous negative, "only an affirmative application of the Imp. μὴ ταρασσέσθω" (as Brückner says), just as in the analogous, Be not afraid, only believe! So the Peschito, the body of the Greeks, Augustin, Hilary, Lampe, Lücke, and, generally, most expositors, even when they do not fully understand the deep significance of this expression. For the Lord is in truth not speaking here merely of the faith of these first disciples in the hour of trial, but He lays down the word for all the future of His entire discipleship, as a testimony that only through faith in Him can a full faith in God be attained and consummated, in the sense of the apostolical teaching, 1 Pet. i. 21. Klee: "Trust in God is the flower of faith in Him," with which agrees the truth, on the other hand, that a certain trust in God must previously be the bud of faith in Him. The juxtaposition of the designedly redoubled πιστεύειν, and the prominence of the καὶ εἰς ἐμέ coming first, has much meaning. On the one hand, to wit, the already existing faith in God must be the *ground* of faith in Christ; but again, on the other hand, the *perfect* faith in God is to be the *result* of faith in Christ:—

[1] Bengel, agreeing with our previous summary, makes the ἄρτι πιστεύετε of ch. xvi. 31 the finally attained goal, as an indicative answering to the imperative of the outset. He proposes to point, πιστεύετε· εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε—but himself withdraws this as needless and overstrained.

Hosted by Google

therefore can the first be only imperative.[1] The co-ordinate expression alone was suitable to embrace both sides of the matter; its καί must first be taken as inferential of the latter, and then more profoundly as giving the reason and ground of the former. This invalidates Olshausen's objection: "besides which, faith in Christ is never added to and put by *the side* of faith in God, but the object of faith is God *in* Christ." Is not ch. xvii. 3 a quite similar *in addition to?* Taken as mere *And* and *With* (as a veil of the deeper connection, which the twofold and yet single faith, however, recognises), the καί rather in both cases must have the great meaning which has been acknowledged by all true exegesis—that Christ by πιστεύειν εἰς is made one with God. Luther: "Here thou seest plainly that Christ Himself testifies that He is equal with God Almighty; because we must believe in Him even as we believe in God. If He were not true God with the Father, this faith would be false and idolatrous." In fact, that Christians and theologians can contest and deny the Divinity of the Son of man, asserting it to be a dogma which goes beyond the Scripture, while they read the Gospel of St John—is to be accounted for only by the blindness of unbelief, which, with all its talk about Scripture and scriptural doctrine, is no other than a deep-rooted unbelief in the immediate truth of the Scripture about which it speaks.[2]

Finally, that our contemplation may include all, let it be observed that He who makes Himself in these words equal with God, speaks at the same time *as the Son of man, with faith in Himself*, as the one champion and predecessor in the faith which He consummated in His death. "If a heroic spirit cries to us—Fear not! that is more than if one of ourselves, himself terrified, should cry to you—let not your heart be afraid! Know then that Jesus himself, the great Hero and Conqueror, cries

[1] Olshausen's proposal to take the imperative first and then the indicative—"Believe in God, and then will ye also believe in Me," is *partial*. This is true and involved in the meaning; but where then would be the appeal to an already *existing* faith? Does this word of *encouragement* tell the disciples that they have not believed in God at all?

[2] "Jesus excites them to a future fearless faith in Him as absent, *just as they believe in God*. They had much better than the Divine manifestations to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." Oetinger.

Hosted by Google

to His disciples and to us this word of encouragement: He *forbids* to you all dismay; He declares it to be quite needless. Ye should do something better than fear." (Zeller.) This μὴ ταρασσέσθω of the πρόδρομος in the presence of His own dying agony was to resound in the ears of His disciples in all their future troubles; for "He speaks thus beforehand, both that He may tell them beforehand of their coming fear, and comfort them while He does so; that they may remember and console themselves with His words." (Luther.) This fundamental character of the whole farewell discourse, spoken beforehand for coming sorrow, is in connection with these first words too often forgotten, because they are attached too closely to the disciples' present case.

Vers. 2, 3. The Synoptics record the leaving desolate of the house of God (now—*your* house) upon earth; and St John now supplements them by an undimmed glance into the upper and heavenly house. For what other than heaven, whence He came from the Father and *whither He returneth* to the Father, can here be called His *house?* In John ii. 16 the earthly house was spoken of, which was to be destroyed; now opens to us the heavenly, in which *the Son* abideth ever, even while He is passing through the valley of death. Compare what we said upon chap. viii. 35, a slight reference to which may here be observed. House is home, where one abides, to which he belongs, in which he has a right: still more—it is a firm, secure building, provided for all kinds of need. It is a "heaven" in the sense of the phraseology of the blessed, as certainly as Christ speaks of it and goes to it—"the archetypal Zion and the archetypal temple" of the most essential presence of God with His people. Whether or not we may call the whole creation, consequently also the earth, the house of God in another sense, that is not here intended—as the analogy with Ps. xxiii., the entire usage of Scripture, and the further discourse here, show. Thus, it is a very incorrect exposition of the μοναὶ πολλαί (and only found among expositors *minorum gentium*), to say, "The whole world is the house of God. In this great house is *not merely the little dwelling of earth*, but there are many other, better, and higher dwellings."[1] Oh no, that which the Son,

[1] Brandt: "He would comfort His disciples upon His going away, by

Hosted by Google

who as the only begotten knows all about His Father's house *above*, speaks concerning the many mansions, is quite otherwise to be understood,—though to the hard of understanding it has always been very difficult.

Before all it must be held fast—though often overlooked—that the expression μοναί is not altogether the same with the τόπος, afterwards, in the μοναῖς, but rather still closely belongs to the οἰκία. Lampe: Non tam designat locum, quam statum ipsum modumque habitationis. (This is somewhat inexact, but it is a presentiment of the truth: non solum locum, sed imprimis habitationis, mansionis modum statumque.) In ver. 23 also it has the emphasis of an *abiding* residence. Where abide we then, if Thou departing leavest us in this unfriendly world? It is to this anxious question of His disciples' hearts that the Lord now replies. Μοναί, mansions, or Bleibstätten (as the Berlenb. Bible translates) indicates assuredly the household character of the abodes, a state of rest in the Father's house.[1] But why have we πολλαί—? To interpret—There is room enough there for more than Myself! is to omit the full emphasis of the plural, besides instituting an unseemly parity between the Lord and His disciples. So also with Fikenscher—"I and the Father would not dwell there alone!" though Euthymius grazes the edge of this sense—ἱκαναὶ δέξασθαι καὶ ὑμᾶς συνεσομένους ἡμῖν ἀεί. This may, indeed, be elevated to the dignity of the great evangelical promise, that there shall never be any separation between our Lord and ourselves, that He will make us partakers of all;—but His "sitting at the right hand" is and must ever be something very different from a μονή in company with many others. This thought, that the Father's *house* is a house for many, lies indeed as a transition in the words, but rather in the previous οἰκία, certainly not in the πολλαί. Further, the general view that there is much room there, Luke xiv.

representing the world as a house, one chamber of which He now left to go into another, while He would be with them in the same house!" This misinterpretation, which unnerves the whole passage, has often presented itself to us in the pages of superficial expositors.

[1] It does not affect the question, that, as Lampe shows in his learned note, μονή in the *later* Greek is interchangeable with σταθμός, as mansio for statio.

Hosted by Google

22,[1] does not satisfy the sense, on account of the strongly emphatic plural. Hence it means not merely that many, already saved, are there—for that would give rise to the important question whether before the death of Christ any had really gone into the Father's house. Nor, "where *many* blessed have and shall find their eternal *abiding place*." (Herschb. Bibel.) For although this expression does justice to the word μονή (compare 1 Macc. vii. 38, μὴ δῷς αὐτοῖς μονήν—"suffer them not to continue any longer"), that is, in contrast with the earth (for the earth is not, as the Correspondenzblatt said, *one* μονή of the οἰκία), yet the μοναὶ πολλαί intends to say more than the μονὴ πολλῶν: there is assuredly involved a *manifoldness* in this portioning out of the dwelling. This appears in the fact itself, that in the great house his τόπος becomes to every one his particular οἰκία (comp. 2 Cor. v. 1)—but when we consider the analogy of the variety of life upon earth, something corresponding to which must be found above, and the hints which Scripture gives us of degrees and distinctions in blessedness, we cannot avoid the conviction that the Lord, speaking from living knowledge, is constrained to intimate this truth here. Tholuck decided concisely that this enters not into the connection; but yet he himself preaches, indeed almost beyond the truth, of the variety of conditions which awaits us on our first leaving this life, of the intermediate state wherein not yet all tears are wiped away, of a period of growth and increase in mansions of the Father—not all of which certainly can belong to this passage. Tertullian: Quomodo multæ mansiones apud Patrem, si non pro varietate meritorum? Quomodo et stella distabit in gloriâ, nisi pro diversitate radiorum? So Theodoret in Cant. i. there are ἀξιωμάτων διαφοραί—not otherwise Chrysos., Theophyl., Clem. Alex., Basil., Gregor. Naz., Hilary, and others. This superabundant mysterious declaration would make the impression upon the disciples, that everything in Jesus' well-known Father-house was well arranged and cared for. We have no-

[1] Luther was content with this: "If the devil, with his earthly tyrants, drive you out of the world, ye shall find room enough to abide above." So concerning the manifold gain of houses, etc., Matt. xix. 29, "If ye have nothing here, ye shall have abundance there. For God has such endless store that He can give to every one of you a hundred mansions for one."

Hosted by Google

thing to do with the modern extra-biblical, or Swedenborgian notions of the distribution of souls in various planets and fixed stars; the Oberlin tables and plans of these mansions we dismiss—whatever of truth may lie at the bottom of them all.

But now let us proceed to the difficult and much-contested following clause! The construction and punctuation, common from antiquity, which made the sentence with *πορεύομαι* dependent upon *εἶπον*, seems to be authenticated by the intervening *ὅτι*. This, indeed, might even then be differently understood; but we regard the *ὅτι* recitativum, explaining that the matter of *εἶπον* follows, as being a gloss. If the *εἰ δὲ μή* is referred, as is undoubtedly the sole course, to the immediately preceding clause —If it were not so (*οὕτως ἦν* or *μοναὶ πολλαὶ ἦσαν*), there arises the sense approved by Luther after Euthym. and Erasmus, and which satisfies many:—*If* the mansions were not there already, I would or I should *tell* you, I go to prepare places for you!" This Luther flatteringly presents in his exposition, "that I would prepare and appoint them, *although they exist already*, so that ye need not care or doubt about your abiding place. In fine, abiding places ye shall assuredly have; if there were not already enough, I would see to it that there be plenty provided; so that, if your hundred for one were too little, I would give you a hundred thousand." And this is regarded as "His speaking in child-like simplicity, accommodating Himself to their thoughts." But if we were not satisfied with that interpretation of the *μοναὶ πολλαί*, containing, as these words do, so distinctive and profound a thought, so we cannot reconcile ourselves to this further view of the whole—and we have many on our side. The strongest reason against it is, that the *going away and preparing places* would then be made hypothetical and an accommodation[1]—while the same *ἑτοιμάσαι* is immediately afterwards resumed in the *ἑτοιμάσω* with all the reality of the actual *ἐάν*, and, as we shall presently see, has its own actual truth. Therefore the construction holds its place which puts the stop at *εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν*: this, after Laur. Valla, was defended by Calvin, Beza, Grotius, and approved by Knapp, Tholuck,

[1] Bengel, after the analogy of ch. xvi. 26, understands it as if it was—I did not say unto you that I was about to prepare a place for you, *since there are already* mansions, and many of them!

Hosted by Google

Olshausen, and Lücke. Then we have a confirmation or assurance, almost like a *verily I say unto you*, but following instead of preceding: "If it were not so, I would have told you, or would now tell you." Calvin: nollem vos frustrari. This is actually His simple, Trust only in My word! I say unto you what is true and real. If it *were* not so, I would *say*, It is not so! Vain consolation and empty forms of speech ye have never received from Me!

This very acceptable meaning De Wette (though he concurs with it) calls "a rather artless assertion of the truth," while Lampe rejected it at once as a *sensus elumbis!* La Roche declares that so far from child-like simplicity being its characteristic, this meaning is so tame that no similar example can be found in the whole course of the Gospels; in fact, that it would give us an *idle phrase*. He would therefore, what critical feeling never allowed before, supply πιστεύετε after εἰ δὲ μή, and then with the ancients connect *I go* with εἶπον—but in such a manner as to take away the hypothetical element. If your faith has been unequal hitherto to appropriate the fact that there are many mansions, and ye cannot now receive it simply, then *I now tell you*, and take My more special assurance—I go even now, to prepare places for you. This exposition was soon afterwards (S. u. K. 1831. 1) refuted by Beck. The carrying on of the πιστεύετε over a whole intervening clause is very harsh, the matter being different in the adduced ver. 11; similarly, the ἄν connected with εἶπον will not allow it to be a definite announcement, as La Roche felt when he called this "a difficulty." Thus far we agree with Beck. But we must maintain, in opposition to him, the simple propriety of the assurance of Jesus—If it were otherwise with the question than He had just said—He would have told them. This turn is not more strange fundamentally than His frequent verily, verily; and even in this discourse we find in ver. 11 the same εἰ δὲ μὴ πιστεύετε, which La Roche forgot to bring into comparison on *this* side of the question. Just *because* "He had even now required the all-embracing *faith* to be exercised in Himself equally as in God"—that is, *desiderates* it still among His disciples, follows now quite naturally the humbling though condescending reference to His own word, against all their mistrust—*Believe* Me only in what *I*

Hosted by Google

say! Beck and Lange (like Mosheim and Ernesti) prefer making it a *question:*—If it were otherwise, would I *have told you* (Lange, however,—*tell* you) that I go away to prepare places for you?—but this seems to us to involve the doubting of His words which is thought so repulsive, even more than the other. (So may we delude ourselves, in bringing forward novel interpretations!) Beck's assumption, lastly, that Jesus might have earlier said something about preparing a place, probably in a first answer to Peter's question, ch. xiii. 36, is a very bold one, but is altogether irreconcilable with the plain record of St John, ch. xiii. 36. Every unbiassed reader must feel constrained to believe that Jesus speaks this great word for the first time here, and in the right place. So that we may regard the former clause as settled, and turn to the next.

The going before and preparing is, as we have said, an earnest and necessary reality, by no means rendered needless by the εἶναι of the many mansions. The preparing is assuredly not merely—"to adorn them more gloriously, and thus prepare them"—for the τόπος is expressly declared to be the object of the preparing. First of all, the house above is *His* Father's house[1]—and consequently He alone has free entrance there, not so ourselves. If, moreover, these dwelling-places are regarded as having been in existence, empty and expectant μοναί, in the eternal purpose of God or since the Creation, yet He alone could *introduce* the elect, and make for them a τόπος therein, that is, give them right of entrance and possession. The τόπος in itself, too, already exists, as in ver. 2 it stands before ὑμῖν, but the reversed position in ver. 3 ὑμῖν τόπον lays (according to Bengel) the emphasis upon this, that it must be now *prepared*, opened up to us. In this we may rest, without more deeply investigating what else may have been effected in this regard by the entrance of Jesus into heaven. Suffice it that the preparing a place *for us* was necessary, according to the whole analogy of scriptural teaching. The shrinking of our heart from the *whither* of the *going away* has its good ground;

[1] On which Bengel remarks that the Lord in the beginning of these discourses speaks most of *His* Father, and later (postquam suæ præ credentibus eminentia cavit et discipulos ad fidem excitavit) He speaks of *the* Father, both His and theirs.

Hosted by Google

but our Forerunner would take away our fear by the assurance that He, the Son, goes into *His* Father's house *for us*. The gracious figure attaches itself (as the gentler πορεύομαι now intimates) to the custom of providing an abiding place beforehand in travelling; but it has here a most profound and real meaning which goes far beyond this.

In the resumption of ver. 3 the ἐὰν is not a mere ὅταν, but indicates a convincing inference—*Only for that purpose* have I gone before, that I might return and take you to Myself. Mark well—to Myself, where I am, for My Father's house is also My house! But when does this return take place, which the Lord here as so often elsewhere indicates with his imminent ἔρχομαι? "The *resurrection* return it cannot be, for at this resurrection visit He had not yet gone. The *pentecostal* return it cannot be, for to the preparation of our places *our fitness* to enter upon and dwell in the prepared place necessarily belongs—nor did He then take His disciples to Himself, to be where He was. Nor is it the *coming to judgment*, for then the Lord cometh with thousands of His saints, and assuredly His Apostles among them. It is His coming to *fetch them home*, since the Lord, *at the death* of His disciples, and of all who believe in Him through their word, actually, though invisibly, returns again for them." (Zeller.) Of this apparently clear statement and distribution, all that we can appropriate is the correct fundamental idea, *that we also must first be prepared for the place;* for the rest, we think that in these sharp distinctions there is an undue forgetfulness of the profound fulness of meaning in this sacred saying, which embraces many things in one, especially of the *fulness of meaning in this promised coming again*, as it pervades the whole of chs. xiv.–xvi. Now at the beginning the Lord does not speak otherwise than He speaks afterwards, concerning His πάλιν ἔρχεσθαι; but there it takes in perspectively the whole series of the resurrection, pentecostal, home-fetching, and judicial coming again, as it was to develop itself by degrees into full consummation. He who does not seize and admit this, will be in our judgment altogether at a loss in the interpretation of this chapter, to which the general canon of the perspective in prophecy admits of full application. The predominant meaning resolves itself, indeed, into its various meanings by degrees; in ver. 18 we have mani-

Hosted by Google

festly the Easter return, as ver. 19 shows; and then in ver. 23 this coincides with the Pentecostal; in ch. xvi. 22, 23, it extends forward, *as will be seen*, actually to the last day for the collective discipleship; when the risen Lord came, that was already a certain quickening, a breathing-upon with the Holy Ghost; if the Spirit is received, then are we already spiritually translated into the heavenly nature, and are there where He is; on the return of Christ at the death of believers that is brought to perfection which to that end was prepared for by the operation of the Spirit in the case of the individual;[1] finally, the judicial return is, as being at the same time a redemption, such a consummation for the church at large, and consequently therein the first full perfection also for the individual. It is not quite true that (as Olshausen says) in *John* "the Redeemer embraces His subsequent relation to His disciples under two aspects, as an *external* departure, and as an *internal* spiritual return"—since this would necessarily require us to apply a perfectly different standard of doctrine to the exposition of St John and to that of the Synoptics. But as the view which regards the death of Christ as itself a going to the Father and a glorification, does not really exclude the resurrection and ascension, so also in the more spiritual apprehension of the coming again lie all the external unfoldings of the same down to the final manifestation. Why should we not understand the pregnant words of our Lord, as all His other discourses and revelations unfold them in their fulness of meaning? He promises here, as Nitzsch rightly preaches, "that He in the power of His love, drawing all to Himself, will in all time come near to every one of us, and return for the redemption of each disciple on his death-bed or in every time of severe pressure, even as *He will return to His whole Church* for its redemption at the end.[2]

His *coming again and receiving* embraces the whole of His

[1] He comes Himself to fetch us, as Lazarus was carried by angels only.

[2] Comp. Hofmann, Schriftbeweis i. 167 ff. Only that here the emphasis is too strongly laid upon the eschatological meaning, the reference to the individual being included only as a preliminary beginning. For our own part, we should not be inclined to press too much the distant and future element in this whole farewell discourse, but to take a middle course. The disciples were troubled, they were bereaved as individuals, and this gives its force to the ὑμῖν, ὑμᾶς, ὑμεῖς here.

Hosted by Google

influence, drawing, setting free (ch. xii. 32, viii. 35, 36), beginning with the resurrection and ending in His final manifestation; His entire work of *bringing home, preparing us for our place* after the place is first prepared. Only that it would be very incorrect to regard this *preparation of us* as itself the proper and only meaning of the manifestly distinctive ἑτοιμάσαι τόπον, as Augustin does, and (following him?) the Bible of Brandt—"Jesus prepared there where He went a place for the Apostles, *in that* He made them in this world by His Spirit, etc., meet for glory." For this undue preponderance of the spiritual and internal element in the interpretation would confound the going away with the return, the result of Christ's departure as obtaining for us the right and power of entrance with the fruit and harvest springing from it in ourselves.

Ver. 4. This, meanwhile, holds good not only of the first disciples, but in its comprehensive prophetic meaning of all future *followers of the Forerunner*, and of ourselves. This gives us, when we rightly understand the fundamental thought of what preceded, the explanation of what the Lord must mean by *the way*. It is not by any means spoken in precisely the same sense as in ver. 6;[1] the word is here closely connected with the foregoing, and we have afterwards (as often in our Lord's discourses) the more profound and concentrated re-interpretation of the same expression. First of all, it is in connection with ὅπου ὑπάγω the way which Himself *goes;* but then, in addition, the way in which He fetches home His disciples. We must, indeed, regard the latter as predominating, or rather as taking the lead, since to the ὅπου ἐγώ there corresponds, as it were, καὶ ὑμεῖς echoing from the former verse. After the Lord had promised to the disciples the preparation of their place, the obtaining of their citizen-rights in heaven, *He remands them as pilgrims who know the way*[2]—that is, their own way through His

[1] Not, as B.-Crusius,—"the way *must*, according to ver. 6, be Himself."

[2] As Nitzsch with a sound exposition preaches. The abbreviated reading —καὶ ὅπου [ἐγώ] ὑπάγω, οἴδατε τὴν ὁδόν, may indeed be genuine, though we would not with Luthardt unconditionally maintain it:—such conciseness scarcely corresponds with the gracious consolation of the whole discourse. It sprung probably from the redoubled οἴδατε, but is not this to be accounted for by the similarly redoubled expression of Thomas?

Hosted by Google

forerunning. Not merely the goal but the way, not merely the *whither* but the *how*. They have now the knowledge of the sure and certain way to their home, to His Father and their Father; they do not, they should not, contemplate merely as from afar the high and mysterious goal which the brightness of His words revealed, but it is brought home to them directly through His promised coming again. Ought not the Lord to be able after three years to say—If I go away, ye know *whither!* whither but to the Father (ch. xvi. 5, 28), to the great house above? Herder beautifully says, "the clearness and confidence with which Christ speaks here, makes, as it were, heaven and earth one." But, indeed, He condescendingly attributes to His disciples the same clearness and confidence, though *they* are far from possessing it. And *the way* for Me and for you, that we, after our separation, may be eternally together? This they should know, that *for Him* it is no other than *death*, glorifying and leading Him to the Father—and *for them?* No other than the *following Him unto death*,[1] in faith and in love waiting for Him, and depending upon Him. To embrace all this in its plain meaning was beyond their capacity; but yet the redoubled and emphatic οἴδατε has its truth. First, as Lampe remarks, interdum quis laudatur, ut officii sui moneatur; thus, ye *might* and ye *ought* to know this. Then, for the future—I have now told you, and ye shall soon understand it. Thus the Lord aims, as it were, to lift the disciples above themselves and their present understanding; irradiating them with His own light. "To suggest doubts to one another, and awaken anxieties, is easier, and has often the appearance of a greater earnestness and precaution against self-deception. To be able to encourage one another—Thou knowest the way, thou art in it! is a greater service, when it is performed in the Spirit." (Rieger.)

We might expect an objection here, especially from *Peter*. He had not been sent away, as many strangely suppose, to

[1] Luthardt opposes that He is not speaking here of their following Him, but of His fetching them home. But this springs from his dread of the spiritual fulness of interpretation: for in truth the following Him is *for us* the first and most essential way in which the Lord, coming back first of all in His Spirit, begins to fetch us home, and prepares us for the final reception to Himself.

Hosted by Google

account for his silence;[1] but ch. xiii. 38 gives us the sufficient reason of his stillness. Thomas, doubtful and morbid, slow of faith but internally full of love, takes up the word: what he says declares his love, which holds fast sorrow for the Lord's departure, but is very far from being secure enough in faith to apprehend the way of following Him and reunion with Him. Lord, I could not say that we, properly speaking, *know* that which Thou supposest us to know—tell it to us once more, expressly and more plainly! By the first clause he encouraged himself to go forward more boldly in a second; so that out of the becoming *question* (see afterwards ch. xvi. 15) an almost unbecoming objection springs. The δυνάμεθα εἰδέναι corresponds precisely with this characteristic of his word; and we would not sacrifice it, with Lachmann and Lücke, to the reading οἴδαμεν. A literally repeated οἴδαμεν in reply to Jesus' redoubled οἴδατε would be a somewhat too bold retort; but a certain *reason for* his contradiction is not at all inconsistent in the mouth of Thomas. He who does not know the goal, how *can* he know the way thither? Rieger deals sharply with poor Thomas: "Many mistakes come together here, which Jesus might have made to recoil upon him. He interrupts Christ; he contradicts Him, and, as it were, denies His truth; he says that they not only do not know, but *cannot* know; he does not speak of himself, but he judges and involves others, saying *We;*—all which was immodest and presumptuous enough." He applies this, however, appropriately afterwards: "But the words of confounded, perplexed, sorrowful men must not be retorted upon them as arrows. His meaning was not so bad as his words. Christ bears with him, and yet vindicates the right. He knows that they did know, *although they did not altogether know that they knew.* Yes, in truth, because an amazed and self-dishonouring heart spoke it, the Lord gives a gracious answer—Lovest thou Me not, then, Thomas? Dost thou not hold to Me, to go with Me and die? Behold, there thou hast *already the way*—for I can say to thee more expressly and plainly, *I am Myself the way!*" Let us

[1] *E. g.* Richter's Hausbibel: Peter and John had been sent away to provide the passover. We cannot believe that Peter and *John* through any case would have failed to hear all these words. Is not John an ear-witness here?

Hosted by Google

observe (after Meyer's note on ver. 22) the indiscreet questions and interruptions of the disciples throughout these chapters, and mark how the Lord's answers, while they are indirect, are sufficient, and uninterruptedly carry on meanwhile His discourse.

Luthardt (i. 135, 136) rightly observes that all this ignorance and misunderstanding of the disciples rested upon the fact, that the character of Christ's life, and His departure especially, did not appear to them to harmonise with the Old Testament. But when the question of Judas in particular (ver. 22) is asserted *not* to have sprung from misunderstanding, but from a *right* apprehension of the Old Testament, we must maintain in opposition the very reverse.

When any one *in our own time*, after the word and the Spirit of Christ have long spoken to him, and the seal of His meaning has been long broken for all sincere souls, opposes his similar *οὐκ οἴδαμεν* and *πῶς δυνάμεθα εἰδέναι*—then becomes he the *unbelieving* Thomas in the worse sense, who *will* not know and believe; and to him a different answer would be appropriate, that of ver. 6 having been given in vain. But a genuine Thomas *asks for the way* in deep earnestness; and such trouble about not knowing will not long be without the consolation of a perfect understanding.

Ver. 6. We have seen already how emphatically and graciously the Lord by His *ἐγώ* brings Himself near to them as Himself their all. It is plain enough to us that the fundamental idea of the whole is the *way;* but the juxtaposition of the two other words is strangely misunderstood: preachers especially are too apt to take the three clauses distinctly,—Christ is the way, *and also* the truth, *and also* the life. This is not exegesis. It is rightly perceived that the two following words serve mainly for the explication of the first; but it is carrying this view beyond bounds to depress *the truth* and *the life* (to both of which the *I am* with equal emphasis belongs) into mere adjectives qualifying the way—as in Augustin's *vera via vitæ*. This is true, but touches only the superficies of the meaning. Beck's words do not full justice to Christ's saying, "He is, *as* the truth and the life, so also the way to both"—for the truth rather corresponds to the way, the life only to the goal, but the proper goal of the way must ever be the Father's

Hosted by Google

house—*to the Father!* Better would it be to say, The way, *because* He is the truth and the life; but this needs a more exact development. And at the outset we must not pass over what the superficial expositors obstinately omit to notice, that the Lord not merely shows or leads in the way, speaks the truth, and gives the life, but decisively says with regard to all three—*I am!* We might say preparatorily, though somewhat mystically,—He is as *man* the way which offers itself to all men —as *God* absolute, independent truth, actuality, essential being —as *Godman* the life, that is, the fountain of life, springing from Him and by us received, for His own. This life is ours in Him, that is the truth, but *before and in order to all* He assuredly is ever our way, into which we must come and walk through Him.[1]

As far as we yet understand this much-pondered saying, it *unfolds itself* in the following manner, and thus alone the organic development of the triune expression is preserved. First of all, in Christ is *the way*, that is, *the* way of which Thomas speaks (Lampe: via illa) and for which all sincerely anxious men inquire—the way to the *Father* and to the *Father's house.* This is the only right way concerning which it should be asked, the way simply, for it alone leads to the goal.[2] This is the holy way, so plainly now revealed that *they who walk* therein, though fools, shall not err. (Isa. xxxv. 8.) In connection with this explicit and fundamental truth the Lord thinks at once (and we also if we are sincere) of the many conflicting *ways of error*, which are devised of falsehood, and lead to destruction: therefore it follows, I am *the truth.* And that, as the personal *am* shows, and the following word confirms, the

[1] We must maintain that the Lord here utters the expression of ver. 6 in the most comprehensive meaning, bringing home to them the whole salvation which was in Him. The predominant eschatological point of view which we condemned in Hofmann, is to be observed also in Luthardt, who makes *this* word "in its direct exposition" hold only an *eschatological* meaning! "The transpositions, applications, and deductions which *men* have based upon this passage," are rather the work of the true *expositor* in the Church, the Holy Ghost. It is not the thought of the final future which reigns in this chapter, but that of the immediate return in the Spirit.

[2] Thus only one way, not "many posterns to the many mansions in heaven"—as the strange book of Julius, über die Hebung, etc., assures us.

Hosted by Google

truth in the highest sense, *living* and absolute, the truth and actuality *of the way*, as at the same time of the end. We might therefore say instead of this—He is the *entire, first and last reality* of all the ways of man's return to God and reunion with Him, because He is no other than the eternal Λόγος who has come down to us from above. (Thus there is included—the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the sense of ch. i. 17.) But the living truth is for us *life-giving*. As the way is and becomes to us truth, so this truth is and becomes *to us the life*: —ζωή is assuredly with its especial emphasis to be taken in this communicative sense. Our life is a death-life, which leads to death; yea it is itself spiritual death, without the life of God in us. (Chap. vi. 53.) But because He is the life in us and to us, He is not only still such *in death* (of which all here treats), but just through His death for us, through His going away and coming again, He becomes life to us. Thus, I am the way, that is now most internally—I as the Dying and yet Living. *The whole saying speaks of the mystery of the cross* of the Reconciliation, it cannot even approximately be understood out of this centre, taken out of this it rather becomes a perversion and itself a lie; for *merely* as a pattern or a teacher Christ is actually neither the way nor the truth *for us*, in *His* life He cannot *thus* become *our* life. As long as the first sanctuary stood, the way into the Holiest was not yet opened (Heb. ix. 8) —but now hath Jesus obtained entrance for us, *consecrated for us a new and living way*. (Heb. x. 20.) And *this* word of the Holy Ghost is actually no other than the supplemental and full interpretation of our Lord's word. The Lord, as the Forerunner and opener of the way, is Himself the way which opens itself unto us; which we have no longer to seek, but only to walk in it, as He says—δι' ἐμοῦ. As "we are wont to say of a way, that it *goes*, that it *leads*"—this figurative mode of popular expression has here its essential, literal truth. Rieger speaks artlessly but with profound propriety: "Who among us makes himself a path for others? What lowest menial in the land would be willing to consent if the prince commanded him to lay his body down as a bridge for him to pass over a ditch which he could not otherwise pass over? But what man finds it hard to do for his fellow, Jesus does for us all. He lays

Hosted by Google

Himself down as a way, etc., etc." In a better, and more scriptural figure—By His cross He becomes our ladder to heaven. That is His way for our sakes, our way through Him. "Apart from Him is the bye-way, error, and death."—*No man* cometh but by Him to the Father. Beginning, middle, end, all is He! But neither the life[1] nor the truth is the *beginning;* as Luther expounds, "He is called the way with regard to the beginning, the truth as respects the means and continuance, and also the life for the sake of the end. He is the first, the middle, and the last round of the ladder to heaven." With this it must be understood that all is in one; for could the way be without truth, the truth without (first following) life? Nevertheless, it remains firm that thou must before all things *begin* with Christ as the *way*—which this word designs to intimate, promising therewith continuance to the goal.[2] Thomas à Kempis (de Imit. Ch. iii. 56), after he has previously followed the customary juxtaposition of one after the other, returns back to the right: Si manseris in viâ meâ, cognosces veritatem, et veritas liberabit te, et apprehendes vitam aternam. Only beginning rightly, by joining thyself to Christ, and hanging upon Him as far as thou knowest Him, especially as He is exhibited to thee in His atoning sacrifice upon the cross, and in this truth and in this life thou shalt not fail to press forward into the full truth of life in all its depth of meaning. Thus it is not as B.-Crusius, with characteristic error, says—"Truth is the beginning, life (salvation) is the end of this way." Oh no, the Pilate-question, What is truth? even though not asked sceptically, but with a philosophical desire to know, has never yet led mortal man to the living truth, unless the fundamental question of the heart and conscience has underlain it—Where is my way, as a prodigal son, back to my Father's house?—Thou needest not to know beforehand and at once even the *πού*

[1] As Klee strangely expounds.

[2] "Christ, in His reply to Thomas, reverses the relation of the thoughts—If they knew the way they would know the whither." (Neander.) "Thomas thought that he who knew not the goal could not know the way. But Jesus shows him that in spiritual things the converse law holds good." (Lange.) Nonnus' paraphrase originated in some such notion—*Ζωὴ, ἀληθείη τε, καὶ ὄρθιος εἰμὶ πορείη.* Just before the "way" had the more proper emphasis.

Hosted by Google

and the πῶς, about which Thomas or Nicodemus may ask:—only walk in the way, it will lead thee, and as the one way multitudes like thee, happily to the many mansions. Theremin responds to the Lord's saying spiritually and profoundly: "Yea, Thou art the goal, and Thou art also the way. So is a stream goal and way at once. I will bend my energies to go thither, where the stream pours itself into the sea, thither where the Son sits at the right hand of the Father. And to reach it I will commit myself to the stream which is my way; and not only a way which guides me, but a *way also which bears me.* Thus come I to Thee through Thyself, Thou guidest and bearest me at once."

Should we then be terrified before this gracious—*I am the way?* Affrighted at the cross and death of Christ, because it is essential that we also go *through Him to the Father,* in this way, that is in fellowship with His death? When even the superficial sense of the words encourages our weak faith—I am the truth and deceive you not! I am the life, and will bring you with Myself safe through your death! If that is not enough He warns and urges us by the last word—*no man* cometh unto the Father but by Me! Thus warningly and exclusively and peremptorily does His word close; but only that it may turn our thoughts to the blessed kernel of promise within—But through Me *every man* shall most assuredly *come* to the Father.

Finally: Does the Lord limit the coming through Him to the Father to those who know His name and have His word upon earth? Far from it! He does, indeed, exhibit Himself at the door of His Father's house as the only θύρα τοῦ πατρός: yet as even for us Christians the very first spark of life out of His fulness is already the beginning of eternal life; every livingly acknowledged truth of His word and nature already the beginning of a guidance unto all truth; the preparatory, sincere walking in His light already a leading to the cross;—so there is similarly, and going still further back, a demonstration of Christ among the heathens, and in natural man. The same saying, inasmuch as independently of a conscious knowledge of the personal Christ all is *not* mere bye-path, error, and death, conceals the assurance that—Wherever any one is in the way to the Father, I am that way! Wherever any one finds truth,

Hosted by Google

that truth is something of Mine and testifies of Me! For I am ever from age to age the life and the light of men. Every not absolutely false way leads to the truth, every real truth has life in itself, but all in Christ.

Ver. 7. Well *for us*, dear reader, that *we* belong to those who already see the Son, whose privilege it has long been to be able to see Him and know Him aright. The gracious proffer of the previous verse—"*I am here!* How can ye then still ask for the way?" does not simply now go on, but it is overpassed by the new thought—"*And the Father in Me!* How should I not be among you the way *to the* Father?" The same which was said in ch. viii. 19 to the Jews, recurs now for the disciples (comp. such another repetition in ver. 12, and so often, as already in ch. xiii. 33)—but instead of the οὐκ οἴδατε there, an οἴδατε has already preceded here, while there even follows a γινώσκετε and ἑωράκατε. As indeed the εἰ ἐγνώκειτε is more than the εἰ ᾔδειτε to the Jews. This doubting *if ye had known*, again, essentially modifies the attributed *knowing* and *seeing* which thereupon follows; as it becomes manifest in the directly contradicting words of Philip, that these words had not yet their full reality in the disciples. It has been much and needlessly disputed, how the Lord could attribute this to them—the ἀπάρτι, from henceforth, being entirely overlooked. This does *not* mean—Since ye have seen Me, since I have been with you; although this *might* and *ought to* have been the case, as is *there*, ver. 9, said to their shame. Here the ἀπάρτι, parallel with the *now* of ch. xiii. 31, and ch. xii. 31, refers certainly to the glorification of Jesus before them which was *from this time* beginning, though for the most part still future. Tertullian well translated—*Sed abhinc* nostis; and Lampe: idem est ac si dixisset: nunc incipitis cognoscere. Similarly, Lücke: "Christ speaks here *prophetically* in reference to the fact that the hour of glorification was already come. Even now, from this time ye know Him, yea, ye *see* Him. Ἑωράκατε may be referred to the Present" (that is, as begun in His last discourses) "without any harshness, as in ch. ix. 37."

So much greater was the difficulty then to the disciples, in whose name Philip comes forward as the second interpellator, to behold with their beclouded eyes the present glorification of the Father in the Son. Again in perfect perversion they seek a

Hosted by Google

God, and even a Father, *apart from* Him! But in the sincere and desiring simplicity of the ignorance yet blended with their knowledge; *not* like those liars whom the world, their sin, *sufficeth*, who therefore *need* neither Christ nor the Father, who only dispute about the way—who have already "their God." Far as the heavens from that mocking question—*Where is thy father?* (ch. viii. 19), the disciples here ask in longing, trusting earnestness—*Show us the Father!* Although it is here to be seen that the general aspect of *error* appears very similar in the malignant and in the simply weak; yea, certain fundamental root-errors must be found maintaining and repeating themselves even in the best, in all their knowledge, until the full enlightenment burst upon them—the knowledge of the *glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.* (2 Cor. iv. 6.)[1] And that makes it necessary to discern rightly the physiognomy of error, to take forth the precious from the vile. (Jer. xv. 19 in the Heb.) "The presumptuous, overwise, childish, luxurious, blear-eyed understanding may cry, Show us! Show us! Prove! Prove! and call out the truth as to a field of war,"[2]—but this is very different from the cry of Philip, *Show us!* which, though it comes from ignorance, yet is the sincere cry of the affrighted and eager spirit. A comparison has been properly instituted with the bold desire of Moses to behold the unseen glory of God, Ex. xxxiii. 18. The error here is, the desiring to have "at a bound" as it were, a highest and last revelation (in all things impossible); but it is outweighed by the boldness of faith in the midst of this unbelief in the already given revelation, which indeed does not suffice because it is not yet sufficiently acknowledged and received. Yea, it is true that there is much wanting here as it respects the true connection between the πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ εἰς Χριστόν; Philip "lets Christ sit there and speak, but cannot cleave simply to the Christ who is speaking to him; disregarding Him

[1] Roos has well shown how natural and not altogether erroneous was the sentiment of the disciples at that time: "They prayed, Our Father which art in heaven! But they saw Jesus walking upon earth, and lifting His eyes to His heavenly Father in prayer. By that they became habituated to think of the Father as dwelling in heaven, and of the Lord Jesus as moving on earth. Their apprehension herein was not erroneous, but imperfect."

[2] Kleuker, menschlicher Versuch u.s.w. S. 31.

Hosted by Google

he wanders away in his own imagination to the clouds—ah, that we could but see the Father as He sits there among His angels! (Luther.) Nevertheless, previous to the true "My Lord and my God" there was no greater honour given to Christ, or higher power ascribed to Him, than in this "*Lord show us*—the Father!" Besides which there is the inexpressible artlessness and fundamental truth (with all its error) of the confident "*And it sufficeth us*," which in itself furnishes an apt illustration of the difference between a superficial and a profound exposition. The superficial understands with Grotius: non ultra interrogando molesti tibi erimus! and even Gossner translates with perfect insipidity—So are we content! The profound finds in it the true presentiment of that highest goal for the aspirations of man's heart, created for God and satisfied only in the living knowledge of Him; the real though half unconscious expression of that great truth—*To see God is blessedness!*

Ver 9. We have said before that the Lord in this ἑωρακώς and ἑώρακε does not intend actually to attribute to the disciples that they *had* already seen and *known* the Father in Him, and thus demonstrate to them, against their palpable protest, that they had known what they nevertheless knew not, and had acquired that which they then nevertheless had not. He *charges* them, however, with this, and it is with lamentation, that it ought to have been so, and might have been so with them. The confidential vocative *Philip* is better referred to the first οὐκ ἔγνωκας, which personally touches the speaker; and then the following great truth comes forward as a *general* statement and answer to all. It is not only permissible, but of the highest use in the interpretation of this sublime and simple word, to translate with Luther—He that *seeth;* as Erasmus substituted *videt* for the *vidit* of the Vulgate. For the sense is no other than—When ye shall have (now soon) "*seen*" Me *aright.* It is not a physical seeing which is referred to, for the people generally had that. Comp. the θεωρῶν after the πιστεύων in ch. xii. 44, 45, from which the Lord here once again repeats His word. The same saying, however, in that passage referred still more to the spiritual seeing of knowledge (as in ch. vi. 40)—here the proper *seeing* is also included, as manifestly appears in μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι. Christ is not merely the revelation to man's knowledge of that

Hosted by Google

which may be known of God, in such a sense that he who knows Him in faith must still retain a desire to *see* Him for his full *satisfaction* (1 Cor. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. v. 7; 1 Pet. i. 8)—but as He is, being the Only-begotten, the image of the invisible God, the brightness of His glory and express image of His person, so also as God become man, He is *the visibility of the Invisible*, as far as and in such way as that *may be seen*. Even in the heavenly beholding in eternity there will be no showing of the Father out of and apart from Him. (1 Tim. vi. 16.) This is capable of deep "metaphysical" application; but it is enough that exegesis, in its stricter meaning, hands over this word in all its unimpaired integrity to speculative dogmatics.

How sayest thou then, Show us the Father?! "This was not a contention which the Saviour had with the Father," says Gossner (probably, as often, after Zinzendorf). Oh that our unintelligent Rationalism would bring all its hallucinations about the contests in theology between the Father and the Son, to the solution of this word of our Lord, rightly understood! The lamentation and the charge is now addressed more earnestly than ever to Christians—Have I been with you so long and do ye not know Me; have ye not yet seen Me aright, not yet seen the Father in Me! Alas, Christ and God are still divided and distinguished, and that not by open unbelievers alone: "just as Philip here does, who passes by Christ and seeks God in heaven." Yet must we ever bring back to our minds the great truth that, even because no man hath seen God, or can see Him, therefore the Only-begotten became man for us! Let us ask and seek for nothing more, beyond and independently of His manifestation, His word, and His Spirit! Let us accustom ourselves more and more profoundly to sink into the blessed mystery of our most holy faith; so that we may correct all transcendental vague thoughts about God by setting Christ at once before our eyes![1]

And here let it be once more noted at the outset, how all these

[1] Not as the painters of the Trinity childishly represented on the one side the Father as an old man, and apart from *Him*, on the other side, God the Son! "The Son is ever the visible face of the Father—rather could we see a man independently of or apart from his face, than we can see God independently of or apart from His Son, who is His face" (Zeller). Thus, dear official brethren, accustom yourselves not to the fatal "God and Christ"—but to the God apostolical *in Christ!*

Hosted by Google

farewell utterances, as heard by the then disciples, are poured out in *one great abounding prolepsis;* for He would, as it were, shed the glory of His revelation beforehand into those darkened hearts which must wait for the full enlightenment of the Holy Spirit. There is no other such contrast and conflict as that which here, at this final juncture, *love* resolves. He speaks ever as if He was already glorified before them, as if their seeing and knowing were self-understood; but they reach not the height of His words, and thus constrain Him more and more definitely to refer their consolation to the coming Spirit of truth. There is a blessed propriety in both. Another Philip may and should now with perfect propriety, with ever deepening urgency, cry—*Show me the Son,* O Thou Spirit who glorifiedst Him! And it is done even as we pray. In as far as we have the Spirit we not merely *see* the Son in whom the Father is, but we *have* Him, He is glorified *in us* and *we in Him.* (2 Cor. iii. 18.) Before this the flesh still recoils, but not the heart which has joyful experience; the impulse to know still asks, but only so as to receive the ever more fully sufficing answer from the seeing of *faith.*

Ver. 10. *Believest* thou then not, not yet, that I am in the Father and the Father in Me? See that this faith *sufficeth thee!*[1] See, *behold,* here is the true *showing!* That is ever the great counter-question in answer to the continuing Philip-word of Christendom. *Believest thou?* That is still the humbling question of the Lord, which rebukes the presumption of every aspiring Philip *in life,* as it is the consoling question which alleviates the sorrow of every downcast Martha *at the grave.* But the evidence for their conviction follows here, as so often before, from the *words* and *works*—and that *in their unity.* That they are to be taken absolutely in their unity is shown in the decisive sentence coming first in ver. 10; ver. 11 then condescends to their weakness by the preliminary separation which leads again to their union—*If* ye believe not My word, yet believe Me for the works' sake! In ver. 10 (with which chap. x. 30, 37, 38, may be compared) there is a parallage elliptica or "ellipsis re-

[1] Not as if Jesus now exchanged the indistinct and paradoxical ὁρᾷν for the plain πιστεύειν—an idea of de Wette's which Luthardt rightly condemns—but the faith in His words should lead to, and become, a beholding of His person in His works.

Hosted by Google

petitionis ex præcedenti et consequenti membro complexæ," so that the Lord means both at once—The words and works are not of Myself, the Father in Me speaketh and doeth them. They are in inseparable mutual influence one; His words *are* no other than works, and His works are speaking and testifying words.[1] Nevertheless, the *words* stand with propriety first and last, first as demanding faith even without the works, and last as the proper object of faith, to which the works have only led back. But the greatest of all, in which all others merge, the work of works, is the act of the redeeming *passion and death*, by which the Spirit was procured for the right understanding of the words. Even that the Father *doeth* in Him, although He as the Father doth not actually suffer and die for us.

THE GREATER WORKS; THE PRAYING AND LOVING; FELLOWSHIP WITH THE DEPARTED LORD THROUGH THE COMFORTER, IN WHOM HE AND THE FATHER HIMSELF COME; SEPARATION IN THIS FROM THE WORLD.

(Ch. xiv. 11–24.)

In the *second* section of this chapter, vers. 11–24, the transition is made, as frequently in these last discourses, from *believing* to *loving;* from *believing* primarily as the reliance and subjection of knowledge, to *loving* as *not merely* fruit and result of this faith, but rather as already the *living germ* of the true and living trust of the person on a person, as the *affiance of the heart*, and therefore the paying regard and observance to His words as commandments—the "keeping" them. He who does not perceive here *this most internal unity of faith and love*, as it is obviously to be found also in the Epistles of St John, he who does not, that is, discern here *that love which the Lord from the begin-*

[1] Schleiermacher: "For what kind of word would that be, which was not also a work? and that were a poor work which was not also a word." Zeller: "The works of Jesus are the rudiments by which we attain to faith in His wonderful and supreme Personality. If we were more like children, and took more time for the contemplation of His person and works, we should more easily attain to that faith."

Hosted by Google

ning requires and recognises, as the true faith of the heart, even in connection with much unbelief of the understanding, will never enter thoroughly into the true connection of these sayings.

Vers. 11–14 is therefore by no means a conclusion belonging to what precedes, but, although immediately deduced from that, forms actually the foundation and transition to what follows:—faith is in preparatory promise awakened, when the greater works than He had Himself done are connected with prayer in the name of Jesus. But *this* faith and prayer has its root—and *that* is the progress of thought—only in an already existing love, which preserves and maintains what is already given; this abiding bond of love, again, with the departed Lord will be first developed and perfected through the promised Paraclete, in whom the Lord returns, reveals Himself perfectly to His own, gives them full life, and separates them from the world.

Ver. 11. The strange reading, followed by the Vulg., which has *οὐ πιστεύετε* as a question, may be at once rejected. The *οὐ πιστεύεις* which was spoken in reply to Philip especially, is followed by a *πιστεύετε* addressed to the disciples generally, as in ver. 1, and resuming the general tenor of the discourse. But the Lord graciously condescends, induced by the unbelief in His unity with the Father which had been disclosed, from the *εἰς ἐμέ* down to the preparatory *ἐμοί*. This preliminary trust includes, indeed, the true and proper ground of all faith, into which the works alone should guide them; for faith in Christ is a trust in His person, which can be fully revealed only in His words, and is in His works revealed only in as far as these *speak*. It is a reception of testimony (ch. iii. 11); an acceptance and recognition of His *Ἀμὴν Ἀμήν*. Thus it goes back again to the *ῥήματα*, ver. 10—"*The discourse hangs so upon the person*, that he who believes for the sake of the words believes in the person which utters them" (Kling). That which in ch. x. 37, 38, and earlier ch. v. 36, was spoken to the unbelieving Jews, must here again be declared to the weak faith of the disciples, just as we all frequently need to hear it still. The *εἰ δὲ μή* pierces us still with never-ceasing conviction: who has not needed often to be referred to the *works* in order to his full acceptation of this or that word of our Lord's mouth? But it is not that the works could testify for themselves, and secure conviction apart from

Hosted by Google

their connection with every witness of the Person who performed them.[1] For if they were not the works of *Christ*, they would avail nothing;—so that de Wette is not right, "the works themselves *apart from the Person*." If it stood *τὰ αὐτὰ ἔργα*, then we might understand simply—for the sake of *these works themselves*, that is, the works of which ver. 10 had last spoken. But because the *αὐτά* stands second, it forms a kind of contrast of the works with the *words* (the works for themselves, without the word), that is, a hypothetical antithesis; although after ver. 10 there could be no proper opposition between them.

Ver. 12. The reference to the works previously wrought by Himself is now wonderfully strengthened and extended into a promise of a more abundant continuance of the same through His disciples after His departure. The "works of Christ" as a testimony before the world for faith cease not with His manifestation in the flesh; they rather become generalised and spiritualised in His disciples through whose agency He continues to work. This high prospect is opened up to the weak faith of the disciples, just as we are wont beforehand among ourselves to awaken and stimulate confidence by confident promises and assurances with respect to the future. So Moses (Ex. iii. 12) had a sign in the same sense; and *that* is the true and most direct connection between ver. 11 and 12 in our passage. The strong assurance is made more abundantly strong by the promise of even *greater* works to those who believe! It is important rightly to understand this, and, without impairing it, to hit the precise meaning of this relative word of our Lord. Frivolous explanations, such as that of Gerhard and Lampe, who make *greater* stand for *more*, that of Theophyl., who makes it a mere hyperbole, or that of others who separate the *greater* from the *works* (He will do *greater* things than such wonders), confute themselves. This last is opposed by the previous *τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ*; and, in fact, *ἔργα* are not exclusively miracles.

We cannot but think of *miracles*, first of all; and we know that the promise, Mark xvi. 17, 18, was not fulfilled solely to the Apostles and first Christians, but is being fulfilled to this day. Many of the ancient expositors referred it to the more visibly

[1] So that it is an incorrect emphasis in Nonnus: *σοφοῖς πιστεύσατε μούνοις ἔργοις ἡμετέροισιν.*

Hosted by Google

striking, and so far greater, miracles of the Apostles (speaking in strange tongues, Peter's shadow, Paul's handkerchiefs, removing of mountains and trees); but this is a petty interpretation, inasmuch as it is in any case *insufficient* as a meaning worthy of Christ and appropriate to His discourse. We would not, indeed, express ourselves so strongly as Tholuck, who says that only an Apollonius of Tyana could have spoken of externally greater works; for the Lord Himself evidently mentions μείζονα ἔργα in Jno. v. 20 with the same reference:—and there is a real difference, *e.g.*, between the ordinary casting out of devils, which the disciples of the Pharisees also performed, and the "Lazarus, come forth!" spoken into a four days' grave in a manner which no Prophet or Apostle ever equalled. Hence we cannot prematurely with B.-Crusius say (and this is another artificial way of dealing with μείζονα τούτων) that the *works* here are not miracles, but *spiritual results* of a comprehensive kind, and that thus it is proved "how subordinate in St John's style of thinking external miracles were!"[1] But a truth lies, nevertheless, in this, that our Lord cannot mean these *alone* in so expressing Himself.[2] That believers should perform *the same* miracles, not excluding raising the dead, was directly said in the *first* clause; the μείζονα which now follows is a *paradox* which presses upon us an extension or deepening of the idea in the ἔργα. Were the miracles actually the sole works, in themselves decisive, which Christ performed? Assuredly not, and therefore they are not so with us. And when we think of the *resurrection* in His own power, the Jonah-sign which first seals all the rest, who can perform greater, or so great? And is not every miracle of the Apostles, however relatively greater in appearance, yet in reality less, in as far as it was performed in the name of Jesus alone, and not by their own power or holiness? Thus, although the τούτων embraces the miracles as still continuing, it means not merely these; and μείζονα added must indicate something different and distinctive for the *works* of every kind.

[1] Is this true of St John's style of thinking, which begins his gospel with miracles, ch. ii. 23, and ends it with them, ch. xx. 30? which records and makes prominent as testimony or fact, the *greatest* miracles, at Cana, in the case of the blind man, and at the grave of Lazarus?

[2] As Nonnus puts simply θαύματα for ἔργα.

Hosted by Google

Is it that "*visibly* great or greater works" are not intended, but the secret influence of good, and spiritual victory—internal works which, however despised of men, are great in the sight of God, who seeth the heart, and looks not so much at the outward act? This does not meet the case, since our Lord does actually speak of works by reason of which others believe, and since in this interpretation the "greater" becomes impossible, and altogether vanishes. It remains impossible that according to any meaning a believer in Christ should perform *of himself* any *greater works* than Christ; for Christ has simply finished *the work*, and all His deeds are alone and supreme by reason of His Person and His essential independent power. We are consequently driven, with many in all ages, to refer the *greater* to the *result;* and this is perfectly suitable, for—works will and must *have effect;* a wider, more energetic, and more successfully active working may in human language *on that account* be termed a greater. Luther: "Here I take the common understanding of this declaration, that for this reason greater works are said to be done by His Christians, because His Apostles and Christians *go further with their influence than He did*, and bring more to Him than He Himself did while bodily upon earth." Although ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ stands opposed first to the Future ποιήσει, the *Present* is significant as intimating that Christ does not Himself cease to work, but the disciples carry on and extend what He did, *because He continues to work in them* (as Aug., Euthym., and others remark on ποιῶ).

The following ὅτι gives the great explanation of the whole: *for* I go to the Father, to give to your prayer henceforth power from on high; what ye henceforth do I will do through you and in you (vers. 13, 14); thus in My seed the pleasure of the Lord will prosper (Isa. liii. 10). For this it is very important not to put a full stop between ver. 12 and ver. 13 (with Chrys., Theophyl., Eras., Beza, Storr, etc.), but to read on *uno tenore* (with Friesbach, Knapp, Schulz, Schott, Lachmann, and Tischendorf).[1] The clause, Because I go to the Father, would, if so closed with a period, and rigidly pressed, lead to the perverted idea that the disciples must now continue to work in the place of the Lord

[1] Grotius: hæc ita uno spiritu legenda sunt—πορεύομαι καὶ ποιήσω; profectus efficiam. Comp. also Cyril in Tholuck.

Hosted by Google

the still greater works, *because He Himself was no longer there!* Oh no, He goes, indeed, but He also remains, He comes again and dwells in them—thus comes the *harvest* of His own invisible *seed* bringing the greater results to light. Mark well, that only to him who believes on Himself such *greater works* are promised! There is, indeed, a certain truth in the expression of the Theosophist: "All capacities and capabilities which Christ exhibited, lie in every individual man"—and in Meyer's note: "By His departure they were even to be heightened for His believers, that is, their outward results and achievements." This really refers also to the power of working miracles, which even Christ, as the Son of man, had *through faith.*[1] But these capabilities especially for the *μείζονα τούτων*, are awakened and put in exercise only in those who believe in Christ, and attained only by prayer in His name.

He sowed, we reap—and the harvest is indeed *greater* than the seed. He bore the first conflict and triumphed unto victory, we manifest and extend that victory, which we ourselves partake of, in the rich blessing shed upon our activity. Therefore the Pentecost sermon of Peter converted more in one day than the Lord in three years; therefore the death of Stephen in peace and joy after the anguish of the Lord's death upon the cross, whom he sees in the opened heaven as at the Father's side; so that faith in the Lord's victory becomes also our victory to the overcoming of the world. Hence also in a thousand ways our individual works are greater as to appearance and result, because "the Lord humbly in His contest with the unbelief which called Him forth limited Himself in His wondrous energy, leaving the greater things to be done by His disciples in His name, when the time of ripeness for faith had come as the result of His own work." (Beck.) What a graciously attractive and lowly manner of speaking is this, on the part of the blessed Sower and Labourer, who Himself alone performs all: Ye, My reapers, will do greater things than I![2] Thus come the greater works, when,

[1] Not as Apollinaris, who pressed and perverted the Church's doctrine upon the unity of the Person of Christ, losing the proper humanity (Dorner S. 1025), and denies this: *Οὐ γὰρ πίστει τῇ εἰς πατέρα τὰ θαυμάσια Χριστὸς ἐργάζεται.*

[2] Lampe: Mixta sunt cum radiis majestatis humilitatis et *συγκατα-*

Hosted by Google

as Braune says, "the streams of Divine power from above are unrestrainedly poured into humanity in order to spiritual efficiency in a greater and more enlarged degree, so that His miracles in the flesh appear small." But not only so—In order to their performance of physical miracles more productive of spiritual results, in comparison of which His own spiritual energy, while He was laying in secret the foundation for theirs, will *appear* less efficient. That "ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ" appropriates this promise to every believer down to the end of time is self-understood; and where the bodily wonders fail, the greater are not wanting. The burning witness speaks indeed with new tongues; the contender with sin casts out serpents; he who is spiritually unhurt by Satan's power drinks deadly poison without harm; the converter of souls gives healing to the sick in a higher sense, and as a greater work.[1] Again, as Luther says: "If he performs such great wonders and works spiritually, *it follows that he also performs them as bodily*, as being at least a beginner and co-operator thereunto. For, whence comes it that Christians at the last day will rise from the dead? that all the deaf, blind, lame will lay aside their plagues, and their bodies, beautiful and sound, shine as the sun? Comes it not from this, that they were here upon earth by the words and ministers of God converted, made believers, baptized, and made one with Christ?"

Vers. 13, 14. I *go*—to death, indeed, but thereby *to the Father;* away from you, indeed, but thereby the more spiritually and effectually to unite Myself with you. I in heaven, ye upon earth—but ye already, *in faith towards God*, know the heaven-ladder of *prayer*. I have now told you—*Believe also in Me!* Do ye not then suppose, that I can be prayed unto also when I am exalted to the Divine power and glory? This would have been the most obvious and natural process of the thought, a right understanding of all that precedes would lead us to expect it, and it is actually involved in the word. But the Lord spares the weakness of the disciples the new and unheard of thought of

βάσεως ejus specimina, quod opus per Spiritum sanctum absolvendum quamvis certo respectu majus ei relinquat, et peccatorum vilissimorum operam in eo non respuat.

[1] See Gregory's beautiful passage in Lampe S. 130.

Hosted by Google

praying unto a glorified man, or to God in and through Him (ch. xvi. 24, hitherto as yet nothing!); thus He at first attaches His words to *their* hitherto notion and custom simply, as it respects *αἰτεῖν*, that is, *τὸν θεόν*. Has not the Father always heard Me? Have I not thus done My great works? Know ye thus in faith, and hold ye it fast even when I am no longer visibly before you—and now let your *faith in My person* become *prayer in My name!* The two are one; not merely does the second follow from the first, but it is rather itself the internal truth and assurance of this faith. He who does not pray to God believes not in God. Prayer is already the internal evidence of faith for ourselves, then the works are the external for others. As it respects the universal promise of being heard, and receiving *whatever* we may ask in faith, we refer to such passages as Mark xi. 24, and others like it: here we have only to do with the meaning of—*In the name of Jesus.* But the understanding of this great word develops itself progressively in deeper fulness. *First*, and according to human analogies, to ask anything *in* or *upon* the name of any one is equivalent to mentioning him in connection with it, *appealing to him.* But even in this the Divine dignity and authority of the Lord Jesus is involved; for whoso can like Him (in the Our Father, Matt. vii. 7) give to men, as it were, a *directory and warrant* to God, to be presented with certainty of being unconditionally and always honoured—must stand in inmost and most immediate fellowship with God. Quite different was the Old-Testament calling upon the *God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob;* it would have been blasphemous to think of calling upon God in the name of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; since it was not a promise given by Abraham, and which was valid with God, that lay at the foundation of this, but merely a promise given by God to Abraham. But when we call upon God as *the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, we find through the Son and in the Son access to the Father, in which we come to God directly through Him. As a *second* sense, which can be no other than one with the former, it consequently comes out that we pray in the *name*, that is, actually *in the person* of Christ, that is, as standing in His place, through His preparatory and intercessory supplication; as if He came in and with us, and Himself prayed what we ask. And this is no mere *as if*, rather

Hosted by Google

it is the essential truth of the matter. Thus we have liberty to enter into the holiest ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ (Heb. x. 19)—"we come no more alone, as we are in ourselves, but we enter with the blood of Jesus, with the same by which He Himself first entered for us."[1] He Himself, His Spirit, it is which prays. We agree with Luthardt that this is the critical point of the whole thought; and he agrees with us in understanding, *thirdly*, that we pray no other than what is *according to His mind, thus in His interest, for His kingdom*, what, and as He bids us pray, authorises and impels us to supplicate. But, *fourthly* and lastly, although the Lord condescendingly adds merely ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου to the αἰτεῖν scil. τὸν θεόν; although it might not become His humility in the flesh, evermore seeking the Father's honour, to speak otherwise (to say, Call upon Me, and I will answer you);—yet will every man, who acts in faith according to His word, naturally come to *call* immediately upon the name of Him, who is with himself by the Spirit at the same time that He is above with the Father—yea, the former only because the latter. Thus the calling upon God in the person of Jesus is an infolded consequence. Indeed, the reading αἰτήσητέ με, ver. 14, and με αἰτήσητε, ver. 13, are false; and the version of Nonnus, "οὔνομα κικλήσκοντες ἐμόν" is premature; but it cannot by any means be established that the prayer of the disciples was to be directed exclusively to the Father. The first prayer after the ascension (Acts i. 24, comp. ch. vii. 58) is addressed to the Son, and the disciples were known as those who called upon His name. For this is decisive enough the clause which immediately follows, τοῦτο ποιήσω, not ποιήσει ὁ θεὸς or ὁ πατήρ; while in ver. 14 this is repeated with the strengthening ἐγώ.[2] That δώσει stands in ch. xvi. 23 of the *Father*, says nothing against this; for, in the unity of the Father and the Son, now one form is used and now the other; comp. also ch. xiv. 16, 26 with ch. xv. 26. He who seeth Me seeth the Father—He who prayeth to Me prayeth to the Father.

[1] As we have expounded it in our Hebräerbrief.

[2] Who is the I? I thought He would say, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My name, He will do it. But He speaks of Himself for a testimony; and those are strange words for a man, to speak so loftily. For by these words He gives us plainly to understand that He Himself is the true Almighty God, equally with the Father. (Luther.)

Hosted by Google

The immediate prayer to the Son is the consummation of the way to the most firmly-believing, most internal prayer; but, because the truth on which this depends cannot be presupposed in every member of a general assembly, the church in her liturgical common prayer adheres (after the Lord's prayer) predominantly to the supplication addressed to the Father; although the Son is also addressed, in compliance with the honour of His prerogative, especially at festivals and eucharists. Let the next clause also be deeply pondered, as it modifies the statement and reconciles these truths, connecting supreme majesty with deep humility, and arguing the unity of the Father and the Son:—that *the Father* may be glorified *in the Son*. Assuredly not, with Erasmus, per filium, but after the meaning of ch. v. 23, Phil. ii. 10, 11, to be understood. "It is He who will do it, and He is therefore also to be prayed to; and to ask in the name of Jesus means to call upon *God* under this *name*—in brief, to pray to Jesus Himself. For, He says, that thereby the Father Himself will be honoured in the Son; that is, honoured of us by our prayer, and glorified through our being heard.—No prayer in the world can go immediately to the Father, even though it be addressed to God direct; all things go to Him and come from Him through the Son. But if we as Christians are fully conscious of this, we pray intelligently to the Father *through* Jesus Christ, and know at the same time that it is altogether the same whether in our address we mention the name of the Father or of the Son. To call upon the latter indicates a species of humility."[1] Instead of this last we would rather say that in its humility it evidences the most inward and confident urgency of prayer. Prayers to the Father are often vague and general, so that a Jew might join in them; the more of Christian urgency in prayer in the Holy Ghost there is, the more immediately does it go to the Son; and then first this prayer to the Son returns back into such address to the *Father*, through Him and in Him, as finds its fullest *truth*.

[1] See the important essay in Meyer's Blätter für höhere Wahrheit (iv. 166) on Prayer to the Redeemer—against the "unintelligible and irrational blasphemy of the words Jesulatry and Christolatry." As if it were an εἴδωλον to pray to Him, who is Himself the true God and eternal life! 1 Jno. v. 20, 21.

Hosted by Google

Ver. 15. This sentence has been in all times torn from its connection, and, in consequence, much misunderstood and perverted. But the connection in which it stands is *twofold* in its aspect: inasmuch as the *loving* of which the Lord here speaks is, according to the principles of all these discourses, twofold; consequently, also, the *keeping His commandments*. This first love to Him, now presupposed as present in His disciples, is the responding dependence of the heart which, as a faith in His love, and a thereby awakened germ of love in return, is already the principle of life in their faith, even in the case of an unbelieving Thomas. But the perfect life of love in order to obedience comes first through the promised Spirit. For both the present and the future this clause stands here in the midst as mediating and transitional. It pronounces clearly both the *goal* of true *prayer*, and the *ground* of true *faith*. After the ὅ, τι ἂν and the ἐάν τι the question arises—For *what* then may we and should we ask in His name? Without excluding any individual object, even the slightest, any external and earthly thing *needful* to us, it is plain at the same time that, if we ask for it in His name, it must be included in the one great interest of His kingdom for us or for others, it must coincide with the one sole desire and impulse of all prayer—that the Father may be glorified in us, as in the Son, so also through the Son. Consequently, for the honour of our own name we *cannot* pray, nor for gold and earthly good, nor for help in need merely as such. For the power to work miracles and remove mountains, only where the honour of His name requires them, or may be furthered by them. But the sincere disciple who has begun to love Christ, and would perfectly do His will, will before all and in all ask for an increase of love in order to its evidence in deed and truth—πρόσθες ἡμῖν ἀγάπην. (Lu. xvii. 5.) Thus the Lord shows us, in connection with what precedes, first of all the object and aim of true prayer, promises us in the way of prayer the very *works* which He requires of His own, and that, as we now see, first of all, as the works of obedience, the fulfilment of the law. The law is through Jesus made to us itself a Gospel. Though not according to the true reading τηρήσατε, yet according to the *sense* of this encouraging *imperative*, standing as it does amid promises, Lampe's remark is quite correct—Non ait

Hosted by Google

servate, sed *servabitis*. (Compare ver. 23.) Vers. 11, 12 were themselves spoken graciously for the elevation of their faith still weak; vers. 13, 14, followed with a still more gracious disclosure of all the fulness of God in His ποιήσω for the αἰτεῖν—and He will not now suddenly between the two affright His disciples by imposing commands in the legal sense. Misunderstanding may rationalistically expound and preach,—*But* all these promises avail only on the *condition* that ye (*already before*, of themselves?) keep My commandments! Far be it! The Lord does indeed exhibit Himself here as in ver. 1, and everywhere in His Divine majesty; speaks like Jehovah on Sinai with His τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμάς, and grounds and sums up the keeping of them all in *love*, just as Ex. xx. 6.[1] But His love has now not only so won the love of the disciples that in this *loving Him*, as the *true principle of their faith*, a nearer relation to God has been established, and a mightier energy set loose in them than the Old Testament knew—but He will further have His commandments kept *from love to love*, while their love asks and receives in faith all that is yet wanting to their completeness of obedience. *His* commandments *are* at the same time promises: he who *keepeth* them, that is, first of all, who carries them into the prayer of faith, and faithfully holds them fast (vers. 21 and 23 afterwards)—he shall more and more fulfil them.[2] That assuredly "knowledge, ver. 17, is given only to love"—as Luthardt seeks to correct my previous remarks—yea, that a loving devotion of faith generally is alone the great decisive condition, vers. 22–24, and the ground of separation between His own and the world, will appear when we come to that passage. But this *love* already existing in us, which the Lord recognises graciously in His ἐάν, is not so the object of a "categorical imperative" that the Lord convicts us by it and impels us through it, but that *we* under its influence are to knock at the gate of heaven and receive grace for grace. Augustin's Da quod jubes et jube quod vis—is also expressed by Apollinaris: τὰ μὲν ὀφείλεται τῷ κυρίῳ παρ' ἡμῶν, περὶ ὧν καὶ παραγγέλλει· τὰ δὲ αὐτὸς παρέχει, περὶ ὧν ἐπαγγέλλεται.

[1] We have remarked on this in Vol. ii.

[2] Berlen. Bibel: "So that we need not think: Alas! *Keep* My commandments!"

Hosted by Google

Ver. 16. The connection appears thus: This now so incredible future of the greater works which I will do through you when ye shall ask in My name; this future, at the same time, of perfect love to Me (comp. ver. 28)—will come, when that Other cometh after My departure, the Helper whom I will procure for you by My going away. New and glorious declaration! Excepting the prophetical hint, Matt. x. 20 (Mar. xiii. 11), Lu. xii. 12,[1] this is now the *first* direct solemn and plain word concerning their receiving the Holy Ghost. We read these familiar words lightly on, but with what astonishment were they first heard! Calmly pondering them, and without terror at heart, they must of themselves have been reminded of the original promise given by the baptizer with water of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. (Acts i. 5.) Similarly, the Lord Himself in Lu. xi. 13 had once pointed to the Holy Spirit as the true and best *gift* of the Father, which they might *pray for* with the fullest assurance of being heard. Nevertheless He does not go on to say—And pray the Father that He may give you; nor, in way of promise, Ye shall ask, etc.; although this was included for all future disciples after the Apostles, and even they remained in prayer and supplication before the day of Pentecost. (Acts i. 14.) For this alone would not have been sufficiently encouraging and consoling. But as He has promised their work as springing from His own, so now does His prayer precede theirs—opening Himself their way to the Father. This is the emphasis of the ἐγώ—and it is not αἰτήσω which is added, but ἐρωτήσω, on which Bengel rightly remarks—familiaris petendi modus. And the Future is not to be overlooked:—In another and altogether direct manner will I pray when I have gone to the Father; and for that purpose do I go. (Chap. xvi. 7.) Thus we have here already intimated the intercessory mediation of the Exalted Redeemer, when and before its fruit for us is spoken of. All is on the ground of pure promise out of His grace and gift; assuredly also, as we have seen, then first will come the perfect loving and full obedience in act. By no means merely that

[1] In the latter passage the strength and clearness of the expression may have been added *ex eventu*.

Hosted by Google

"the sending of the Holy Ghost is regarded as the rewarding consequence of keeping His commandments."

The doctrine of the Divinity and personality of the Holy Ghost, which in the first period of the history of Christian dogma was developed with little precision,[1] has its foundation here in the manifestly personal name παράκλητος, who is further by ἄλλος placed on a level with the Lord Himself; comp. ver. 26 and chap. xv. 26, xvi. 8, 13, 14, ἐκεῖνος. The distinctive meaning of this ἄλλος and ἐκεῖνος must hold its ground against all the wonder of Frommann and others that so much should be made of them; and they will prove that here at least St John's doctrine has no such "wavering and shifting character" as has been ascribed to it.[2] For, on the other hand, as has been urged in Polemics, the name Paraclete is not referred to as another, but when this Comforter comes, comes at the same time the Son and the Father: vers. 18–23. B.-Crusius speaks most pervertedly: "The Paraclete is no more described by John as personal in any other respect, but this is also without any proper personification—the *semblance* of a personal description (only the semblance?) is retained, inasmuch as He was to be *exhibited as* the representative of Christ!" Such Rationalism we may now cast behind us, with much other foolish babbling of a former time, such as that of Eichhorn: "παράκλητος signifies the *doctrine*" of Christ Himself and the enlarged understanding of this doctrine—against which Storr condescends to observe that then it would be strangely discordant that in chap. xvi. 13–15 such a diffuse proof is given that the doctrine should not be different from the doctrine! Even Hezel in his time let fall the confession that, "if we would rather abide by the letter and understand by the Spirit of truth the third person of the Trinity, etc." Yes, verily, the letter does so speak, and we must hold it fast; only that we would better understand the "third Person," than some of our unspeculative dogmatics. Christ is Himself in His person the one Paraclete; in part already with the disciples, in part afterwards more properly with the Father; and by His side with like personality stands the *other*. We have already in ver. 16

[1] See the description of his own age in Greg. Naz. Orat. 37.

[2] Compare in Lange Leben Jesu, iii. 712, 713.

Hosted by Google

more plainly the three acts of the three Persons: asking, giving, abiding. So it goes on, and if we had only these three chapters of St John, the trinitarian dogma would be incontrovertibly evinced from them alone.

But now let us more closely look at the meaning of the important and not in itself difficult word παράκλητος, which the Syr. and Vulg. as also the Pers. translation leave unaltered. We do not find the word, indeed, in the Sept.;[1] and in St John, apart from these discourses, only in John ii. 1. Its signification should be plain enough, being substantiated by the grammatical form of the word itself, by the invariable and sole demonstrable usage of the Greeks, by the perfectly corresponding Latin *advocatus*, and even by the transition of the word to the Jews: nevertheless, it has been misinterpreted (as, in the last note, Aqu. and Theodot. fall into the common confusion of the expression), as if it might be and must be equivalent to the active παρακλήτωρ, παρήγορος. Origen and most of the Greeks oppose the spirit of the language, and make it παραμυθητής; Euthymius, παραινετής; Jerome, Erasmus, etc., *Consolator*.[2] It is not to be denied that *comforting* and *encouragement* is involved in the office of the Holy Spirit, even as *teaching* is (see presently ver. 26); but the comprehensive and profound official name παράκλητος, which *includes* that meaning, coincides with *that* παρακαλεῖν only in appearance, and cannot possibly be taken for παρακλήτωρ. Least of all can it be merely *Teacher*, or *Reminder*, as Theodor. Mops. thought, as Lösner (obs. ex. Philone on John xvi. 16), Vollborth, Ernesti (Opus. phil. crit.) have endeavoured to establish philologically. We would ask, Is τροφός with its active meaning really a similar form to παράκλητος, and, Does the Lord here speak merely as a departing διδάσκαλος? If "encourager"—speaker *to*—suffices (in the New Testament use of παρακαλεῖν), where is the advocate—speaker *for*—of 1 John ii. 1? The passages of Philo do not prove what they are adduced for; and the οὐδενὶ παρακλήτῳ (de Mundi Opif. Tom.

[1] In Job xvi. 2 for מְנַחֲמֵי it has rightly παρακαλήτωρ; but Aquila and Theodotion παράκλητος, and Symmachus παρηγορῶν.

[2] For παρακλητικός, *comforting* (Schol. ad Æschin. Prom. 379) does not by any means fall back upon the form παράκλητος.

Hosted by Google

i. pag. 5 ed. Mangey) is not just *nemine monente*. The פַּרְקְלִיטָא of the Chald. in Job xvi. 20 and xxxiii. 23 is used plainly in the sense of "intercessor, mediator, manager;" for, "interpreter or expounder" certainly has nothing to do with the *former* passage.

We must, with Knapp, who first established it, though without sufficiently developing its exegetical consequences, hold fast the usage of the Greeks and especially of the orators, which makes παράκλητος, corresponding to the Latin advocatus, a *counsel* called in, a *pleader*, an attorney, and more generally an *intercessor*, as, *e.g.*, in Diog. Laert. 4, 50. This approves itself here out of the context, as well as by the parallel expression in 1 Jno. ii. 1, which must have looked back to this passage; for wherever this companion Epistle refers to the gospel *we have an authentic exposition of the Evangelist.* If Christ is first the one παράκλητος, in whose place the other is promised, then must for both the same fundamental idea hold good; but Christ is (even upon earth, in the case of the fearful disciples as opposed to an opposing world, and still more in heaven with the Father) our Representative and Counsel, who speaks and acts for us, thus and thus alone being the Helper of all who call upon Him and receive Him. This (in the accompanying ἄλλον) is the point of connection, and the *reason* why the same expression is used likewise with regard to the Holy Ghost, being then for Him *expanded* into teaching and bringing to remembrance. For the *Rabbinical* usage see in Buxt. Lex. the passage Pirke Aboth c. 4, where פְּרַקְלִיט as intercessor stands in immediate antithesis with קָטֵיגוֹר (κατήγορος, Rev. xii. 10)[1]—and the gloss upon it: פְּרַקְלִיט הַמֵּלִיץ טוֹב עַל הָאָדָם לְמוֹלְכוֹ est interpres bonus pro homine apud regem (magistratum)—comp. 1 Sam. xix. 4. Thus παράκλητος is advocatus, as Tertull. and August. say; but that not merely, as Grotius thinks, "Who vindicates their cause *with the world*"—but performing, in a deep and comprehensive sense, all that which a *Counsel* or *Representative*, being at the same time an *Adviser*, can perform for us. It is not plainly established that Luther followed merely the *Consolator*, for

[1] As this latter elsewhere with סָנֵיגוֹר συνήγορος, see Buxt. and add R. Juda in libr. Musar 126. 2, and Schemoth Rabbah xviii. fol. 117, where Michael and Sammael are similarly opposed.

Hosted by Google

Scherz and Oberlin show that in the documents of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, "Tröster" meant Intercessor, Surety, Representative of an absent person. If he had translated "Beistand"[1] it would have been better, though that would again have needed explanation for the people; it is not needful to alter our translation here, since we can place the whole true meaning on the word Tröster, Comforter. And we, with most others, would hold fast the sanctified expression.

The fundamental point of view for this great word of promise is the presupposition—Ye *need* a Helper and Representative, such have I been while yet present with you. To this is then attached—although the *I will ask the Father* intimates that the Lord will continue His office, and indeed first really begin it, above—the promise of that *Other* who should carry on the same office *in another relation.* This, too, is intimated, if not in the *other*, yet in the *with you;* for we may say with the fullest truth that Christ carries on our cause with God, while the Holy Ghost, on the other hand, carries on God's cause *with us*, and for us against the world. He appropriates to us the supreme intercession of Christ as if it were inherent in ourselves (Rom. viii. 26), speaks in us and from us, as most essentially the intercessor whom our infirmity needs. Ask thyself, poor mortal, whether thou dost not need such! That the same Person also further comforts, encourages, reminds, teaches, is understood and involved in the same general fundamental idea.

That He may *abide* with you for ever! we cannot with Lücke accept Lachmann's reading (ἵνα μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ᾖ) instead of the penetrating and affectionately consoling clause as it now stands; or admit that the μένῃ was transferred from ver. 17. The *abiding* of this *other* Comforter intimates the necessary contrast, that He does not go away like the first. The disciples would understand—I, as your sensibly present Helper and

[1] Which right expression he for the most part adds in his exposition and sermons; we read in *Kähler's* third Lutheran Catechism (Kiel, 1849) as the very words of Luther: "The word Comforter, from the Gr. paracletus, signifies one who stands as the counsel of an accused party, who takes of his to defend him, who pleads his cause and serves him by advice and help, admonition and encouragement, as his case needs." Similarly, Wicliff, from whom the English "Comforter" comes, derived it from the Latin *confortari* (see in Alford).

Hosted by Google

Counseller, go away, but through death to the Father, in order to pray the Father that He may give you another abiding Helper and Counseller. He will abide, without departing again, with you εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα—which last literally and essentially involves eternal communion with God in Christ through the Holy Ghost. But we must not, with Lampe, deduce from this a δόμα ἀμεταμέλητον, the impossibility of losing again the once received Spirit—the entire Scripture, and specifically Heb. vi. 4–6, protests against such a perversion.

Ver. 17. This other Agent, Representative, and Counsellor, now receives in immediate connection another name, derived from that *influence upon us which is primarily necessary*,—as further in the Old and New Testaments we find many names of the Holy Spirit designating Him according to His energies and gifts in us. It is *the Spirit:* this at once diverts from any such expectation of a visible Person as the ἄλλος might have excited, while it also points back to all which from the Old Testament had been recognised as the רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים or רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ. But now it is added, *The* Spirit *of the* truth, which repeated article expresses more than our common translation, Spirit of truth, or merely, The true Spirit. Beck says well: "They receive from Him not merely a dead word, such as all scholars have from their teachers; but they have a living word, the Spirit of the truth—for the life of the word is the Spirit." He has sufficiently shown already that he does not mean this in the sense which we must sometimes oppose in others, as if the Spirit was not coming in the future, but left behind; we would, however, prefer to say, in more scriptural language, that they have now from their Lord and Master *not merely* the word, the doctrine left behind Him, the most precious legacy of humanity, the words of the Word—but *in addition to* the word comes to them the Spirit, and that the Same who thought and spoke in Jesus, in order to re-awaken and vivify that word in them, for the *quickening* of the word is the Spirit. This alone is the true relation between the *coming* Paraclete and the words of Jesus *left behind*, as is shown in ver. 26, and ch. xvi. 14. The *Spirit* connects Himself with the word, works onwards, not independently of it, but through its medium: nevertheless He is, as Spirit, as coming in addition, the self-sufficient and sole *Teacher*,

Hosted by Google

who teaches over again the *doctrine* left behind in the letter, and Himself first gives it life.

Christ Himself had hitherto discharged His office of Paraclete to the disciples by His word, by the word from God to them, and to God for them; but this had been *to them*, on account of their weakness, only a shadow and type of the great reality. To say concerning their departed Lord with St John, *παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*—became their privilege only when that Other came, who being at the same time the Representative of Christ, *makes that their own*, placing them in clear and full and secure possession of that truth. We may thus unfold the subject: Every representative and counsel, every *advocatus*, is pre-eminently a *patronus* and friend of his client, but the first care of the benevolence of a true friend is to speak the truth, to reveal the true position of the case, favourable or unfavourable; that the client may thoroughly well know how it is with him. Hence this is also the indispensably first and fundamental business of our heavenly Advocate, although by no means the only or the last. He who makes the office and work of the promised Paraclete rest *solely* upon this "Spirit of truth," as so many do without a deeper understanding of it (ch. xvii. 17 will make this plain)—understands the meaning neither of the one name nor of the other. The Lord Himself can now speak no further of the subsequent, and essentially intercessory, work of the Spirit; He has only intimated it silently in the first name: that will be known hereafter when He comes, and the Spirit of truth approves Himself also the Spirit of grace and of prayer, of faith, of adoption, of power, of love and discipline, of holiness, and of glory—when they will be able to say by experience, with St Paul, *αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*.

Thus, for the first: The Spirit utters, teaches, brings to us as Spirit in real and living apprehension the Truth—that is, the truth concerning ourselves, the will of God as regards His justice and grace towards us, our position and calling, the way of return to God through the person of Christ; He shows, glorifies, *opens* to us this *way* as truth and life, so that we *know* what follows in ver. 20. He gives us as a first truth the knowledge of our sins, as a second the knowledge of the Saviour whom we possess, and these together are *the* real and perfect truth for us. He flatters

Hosted by Google

us not, as the false interloper Absalom at the way of the gate, See, thy matters are good and right—but He adds, nevertheless, with regard to our evil matters the word of full authority, Thou hast a man deputed, a mediator with the king! (2 Sam. xv. 3). This truth concerning our relation and way to God by no means dwells in our own spirit; all the mediators and friends who enter in by means of the natural understanding are deceivers and miserable comforters, מְנַחֲמֵי עָמָל—not only when they still charge poor Job foolishly, but also when they falsely justify him. But all such individual truth as had been already taken out of the whole truth, and testified and taught in the Old Testament, is completed and closed as the full consummate truth, *the truth* simply, by *the* Spirit whom now the Father sendeth in Christ's name, and Christ sendeth from the Father. "What no eye had seen, what Christ Himself could not say (at least, plainly and expressly), what no Christian can speak to the world and to the weak, *the Spirit* now teaches." (Häfeli.) We even continue, What generally may never be spoken and taught in human words! From the Spirit come to us not only the *groanings unutterable* of prayer, but also the *words unspeakable* of knowledge and revelation. Thus to Christians Pilate's question in every, even the best sense, is utterly abolished, because Christ no longer stands without before them alone, but the Spirit bears His witness that the Spirit is the truth. (1 John v. 6.)

But now after this abounding promise of the first name comes immediately the mournful, decisive restriction, Whom *the world* cannot receive! And why? Is not the old liar and murderer, the prince of this world, to be cast out, so that the world may be saved, and attain to life in the truth? Was not the Spirit to be poured out on *all flesh?* Do not all these promises, given to the first disciples as representatives of all future disciples, avail actually for all in the world who should afterwards hearken to and believe in the Spirit? Assuredly, but the Lord does not now refer to these, these He had already in anticipation fulfilled to the disciples; on the other hand, this same *world*, in the strictest and most rigorous sense of the word, remains and *first declares itself truly* such when the Spirit comes,—the world which receiveth not the Spirit *because it will remain the world.* It does not say, It *is not to* receive Him; but it *cannot*, for to receive Him re-

Hosted by Google

quires a *susceptibility*. It cannot—"such a word has the Lord Jesus spoken with profound sympathy, and when we utter it, it should be in the same feeling; but such a word, nevertheless, He did not see fit to withhold." (Rieger.) As long as it remains *world* as such it cannot, and with those who are here intended it must ever be so. And it may be said, alas, "baptism and anointing are wasted on the world"[1]—yea, also, the testimony and influence of the Spirit!

And *wherefore* not receive? "*Seeing* and *knowing* is the only way to receive and enjoy, in the kingdom of heaven even as in universal *nature*." (Häfeli.) It may at first appear strange that as for the Son so also for the invisible, inwardly working *Spirit* too, a *seeing* should be required; but this very θεωρεῖν teaches us the true sense in which alone it must be understood, for instance in ch. vi. 40 and elsewhere. The beginning and ground of all *knowing*, in which the object is appropriated by the subject, is an internal true *beholding* of the object; this is its necessary condition. To this beholding, especially of the truth itself in Christ, in the Spirit, belongs not merely unprejudicedness, but most essentially a desire and sense of need going out after it, and the want of this confounds and blinds the soul. Hezel was right when he unconsciously corrected himself thus (although *this* does not properly, certainly not solely, lie in the word θεωρεῖν), "Because the world *looks not about* for the Spirit of truth, troubles itself not about Him, and attaches no importance to Him." Or the Berlenb. Bible, "It turns not its eyes to Him, but *looks away from Him!*" It needs no Helper, it is contented even without the Father. It *desires*, and *therefore* "sees and knows only what is useful to it, receives only (to abuse and pervert) what the goodness of the Creator has inlaid into external nature and the nature of man; but it sees not and knows not what the saving grace of God proffers to it." (Beck.) But we must investigate the word more profoundly, for this is only its first meaning. As in the days of His flesh those who would not and could not behold the Son in Himself were yet constrained to *see* Him, and those who received not His word heard it at least, that the stony ground might be sown for a testimony—not

[1] Luther's Tischreden, latest edition by Förstemann, i. 15.

Hosted by Google

otherwise does the Spirit manifest Himself and offer Himself in His influence to the world. But now comes in the final emphasis of the following οὐδὲ γινώσκει—And *if* in a certain sense it is constrained by the power of God to see Him, *it knoweth Him not*, because and even as it does not *acknowledge* Him as the Spirit of the truth, and thus *will not* know Him. There is yet a truth in men, an assenting response, a criterion for the acceptance of the self-revealing truth of God; but it is held in unrighteousness, and this is strengthened by the *spirit of lies*, the opponent of the Paraclete. When devils are manifestly cast out by the Spirit of God, the daring Beelzebub will himself cry from the lips of his own, when he can do no more, to Christ—Thou castest them out by Beelzebub! What befell the Son at the hands of unbelief, is repeated with intenser energy and deeper decisiveness with regard to the Spirit. Let it be observed, that notwithstanding the name πνεῦμα He is spoken of as a *person* in the οὐ θεωρεῖ, as if it had been said, The world deals with Him as it deals with Me. And, finally, let it be noted that this exclusion of the world with the statement of the reason οὐ δύναται, was not intended as a warning to the beloved disciples (who were already no longer of the world, ch. xv. 19), but was graciously spoken beforehand for their *consolation*. This is excellently unfolded by Luther in an often-cited passage of his exposition, the ground-thoughts of which are: When they look around them and see so many people, not mean or insignificant, scorning their doctrine—this would terrify and stagger weak-believing hearts. Are they then all and altogether wrong, we alone being right? But this stumbling-block the Lord obviates for His little flock, and teaches them to question nothing about the world, so that they themselves have assuredly the Holy Spirit of truth.—*Therefore* follows, in order to indicate the great separation and decision which the Spirit will effect, the comforting *But ye* know Him! How then already in the Present? We must not misunderstand this as meaning, *Since ye already know Me;* or, then go on to make ὅτι (with Lampe) equivalent to διὸ, *Therefore He abideth also with you.* The Lord here once more evidently speaks in prolepsis; the present tenses as a whole intimate the future state of things, as Lücke rightly says, "Jesus places in juxtaposition and opposition the characteristics of the

Hosted by Google

κόσμος and of the disciples." Hence we are inclined to prefer, with him and with Luthardt, the reading ἐστίν instead of ἔσται, particularly on account of the corresponding ideas—The *Counsellor* abideth *with* them, the *Spirit* is *in* them. It must of course be assumed that the Apostles had been already made susceptible by Christ for receiving the Holy Ghost. "The coming of the Holy Ghost would so entirely coincide with all that they had understood of the Lord's words and intercourse with them, and with all that now followed, for the excitement of their desire and of their faith, that *they will at once know Him* by the Lord's former teaching." (Rieger.) Only, as in the case of the world the reasons for the *future* οὐ θεωρεῖν are intimated without being expressly uttered, even so it is in the case of the disciples; the γινώσκετε αὐτό cannot possibly mean at once that they already knew and possessed the Spirit in Christ, for the μένει plainly refers forward to the previously promised ἵνα μένῃ. And, in conclusion, the general contrast with the unbelieving *world*, not with other believers and disciples, makes it plain that the entire promise of the Comforter, and the ὑμεῖς δὲ here, by no means applies to the Apostles alone.

Ver. 18. Now indeed *these* are more particularly the representatives of all discipleship. They are His little children (ch. xiii. 33)—He the Father of the house, for whose sake they have forsaken father and mother, house and goods; yea, still more, had so utterly renounced the world that between them and it all was for ever at an end. And now He goes away from them, leaves them behind Him in this evil world—as with Mary weeping, They have taken away our Lord! Then would they be indeed sheep without a shepherd, *orphans* without father, protection, or help, without advocate or helper. It is well known that ὀρφανός is used generally *de omni destitutione;* but we hold fast the common signification, which partly adheres to the τεκνία of ch. xiii. 33, and partly refers to the Father in heaven, of whom they should not be deprived—see presently ver. 23. A new element is introduced into this gracious consolation for their amazed hearts, as we find it constantly recurring in these discourses—I will *not* leave you as orphans! I go away, but I come back again to you at once! We must not interpose here, with Semler, a foolish *interea*—I will not leave you altogether alone,

Hosted by Google

even so long as *till He, the Spirit cometh.* But the Present ἔρχομαι, which brings it so near and overpasses the ἔτι μικρόν of ver. 19, means much more than the resurrection return; it includes (according to the above canon of a perspective connection of comings) actually His coming to continue with them in the Spirit. The coming of the Comforter and the coming of the Lord Jesus are essentially one: He cannot humanly speak of them otherwise than by making them interchangeable, distinguishing and yet uniting them. Augustin: Post promissionem Spiritus sancti, ne quisquam putaret, quod ita eum Dominus daturus fuerat, velut pro se ipso, ut non et ipse cum eis esset futurus, adjecit atque ait: Veniam ad vos. The Representative of His visible presence is Another, and yet in the unity of the Trinity it is no other than Christ Himself in His invisible real presence.[1] The resurrection was the pledge and further preparation for this coming, and of this ver. 19 expressly speaks, though not only of this. It is altogether inadmissible to refer it, with some of the ancients, to a coming to *judge the world;* for there is no ἔτι μικρόν reaching so far, nor would it be true that *the world will not then see Him.* Both these are decisive against Luthardt's exaggerated reference to the Parousia at the last day, although he thinks he has established it here! This ἔτι μικρόν is, in fact, not the same as that of Heb. x. 37, or equivalent to the ταχύ of Rev. xxii. 7, 12. And it would be contrary to the entire context in *these* discourses to think of the whole church as being orphaned or comfortless till the last day!

Ver. 19. In ἔτι μικρόν thus connected with ζήσεσθε the Lord probably thinks of that prophecy of His resurrection *on the third day*[2] which is to be discerned in Hos. vi. 2: καὶ ζησόμεθα ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ; and the καὶ γνωσόμεθα following here in ver. 20 strengthens this view. It is indubitable that the resurrection, to which the first words properly refer, is *first* of *all* intended

[1] Not merely, "The Jesus of their child-faith is glorified into the Spirit of truth for the faith of the man" (as Braune improperly says)—but even the Spirit of the truth makes Himself ever more perfectly known as the Christ living in us. Kahnis: "It cannot be doubted that the Lord views the sending of *the Holy Ghost* as a *coming back in His own person.*"

[2] See upon this prophecy, our remarks in vol. i. on Matt. ix. 9, etc.

Hosted by Google

(as ch. xvi. 16 in a wider connection), and that their seeing Him again in the body must be included, although Lücke contradicts this; not only is the resurrection included, but it is in ἔτι μικρόν, in οὐκέτι θεωρεῖ (Acts x. 40, 41, a type of the exclusion of the world from seeing the Holy Ghost), and finally in ἐγὼ ζῶ, positively and strongly expressed. Even Kuinoel and de Wette agree with Lampe and Bengel in assuming a "double sense" here; though the meaning is not properly double, but is one in the centre of the scriptural truth.[1] The discourse advances with a deepening development of the expressions—*Ye* shall *see* Me first externally, then and thereafter in the Spirit, ye shall *live* as I live, when ye shall *have* Me abidingly in the Spirit. First, there will intervene a renewal of the bodily seeing, which is the transition to their living. Then, too, *living* must be taken here in the full and deep sense of the word, especially after the promise of the Spirit who should be in them.[2] This Spirit gives *counsel* and performs His *work*, He is in the Spirit of truth also the Spirit of life. For what would be counsel without help, what would be all truth without new power, without new life in order to the obedience of the truth? The mere so-called knowledge avails not for this. Therefore *Spirit* of the truth, and the Spirit who *giveth life* by the truth. Christ designedly omits to say ζήσομαι concerning *Himself*,—although His meaning includes a reference to the resurrection as demonstrating His inextinguishable Divine life,—for He liveth in God eternally. Yet He does actually utter this ζῶ "with death in view"—makes it a *pledge* to His disciples that they shall have a life, beginning with their spiritual resurrection and extending onwards to eternity—*implicitly promises*, consequently, also the subsequent bodily resurrection of all His own, but all as resting upon the sole life-principle imparted by the quickening Spirit. He who possesses the Spirit and in Him Christ, may speak joyfully and

[1] "It would have been very strange if Jesus had not at this moment referred to His resurrection, just at the time when His disciples most needed such a consolation; and it is doing unnatural violence to the ἐγὼ ζῶ to regard it as having no such reference." So de Wette, who then, though not clearly or profoundly enough, connects with this the spiritual reference.

[2] Hezel's dull spirit thus expounded: When I show Myself alive again, ye *also shall be still alive!* For they might have feared that they would all be destroyed.

Hosted by Google

confidently in the presence of death to the king of terrors, in the language of Luther: "Knowest thou not that thou didst devour the Lord Christ, but wert obliged to give Him back, and wert devoured of Him? so thou must leave me undevoured because I abide in Him, and live and suffer for His name's sake. Man may hunt me out of the world and put me underground, and that I care not for; but I shall not on that account abide in death, I shall live with my Lord Christ, as I know and believe *that He liveth!*" There is *no* other guarantee for our personal continuance in the integrity of our being, and consequently, also, as that is inseparable, for the resurrection of our bodies, than *the personality of Christ*, in whose ἐγὼ ζῶ, declared in His resurrection and assured to us by the reception of His Spirit in ourselves, we have the firm and sufficient foundation for—καὶ ὑμεῖς ζήσεσθε.[1] All other arguments and hopes of immortality are like shadows and vapour before the light and power of this living word. (Rev. i. 17, 18.)

Vers. 20, 21. By the general formula of the Prophets for an indefinitely left Future opened up in perspective—בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא, the repeated use of which (ch. xvi. 23, 26) places these discourses under the canons for the exposition of all prophecy,—is denoted here specifically, as sometimes in the Prophets, the near and certain dawn of the *day* of a more glorious future, of clearer light.[2] This now promised γνώσεσθε serves as a confirming interpretation of the γινώσκετε, ver. 17, and even ver. 7. Then, when the day of Pentecost has become the Easter day of your hearts, will ye no longer say unto Me, Lord show us the Father! nor will ye say any more, Lord, show us

[1] As Göschel's Ostergabe (1835) bears this great word as its motto. R. Rothe would *conversely* base upon the certain continuance of our own being as spirit, the faith in a continuance of Christ's life (now without flesh).

[2] "Such things in truth understands no man, for whom *the day* has not dawned which Abraham beheld of old with joy" (rather—desired to see, and saw when Christ came), "and concerning which Jesus spoke to His disciples, Jno. xiv. 20, At that day ye shall know, etc." Oetinger. This is more in the spirit of St John than Luthardt's over-rigorous eschatological exposition, who thinks that the only alternative is the day of Pentecost or the day of the Parousia. Does he not in any sense acknowledge the prophetical perspective?

Hosted by Google

Thyself! at least without receiving the fulfilment of your desire. The three stages of mutual indwelling are to be understood according to chap. x. 14, 15. The knowledge that Christ is in the Father (as the Father in Him, ver. 11) may be without living influence, or may be still held by those in whom it has become unfruitful; but the knowledge that we are in Him is really possible only through the Spirit of truth and of life, and leads at once to the last and highest conclusion, that He also is in us. After the Lord has thus, vers. 15–20, risen from the first preparatory commencement of fellowship with Himself up to its full consummation, He now comprehends in one summary both sides of the truth,—the first love to Himself in the germ of faith is the condition of a perfect future revelation. *My commandments*—to be understood just as in ver. 15 of His ῥήματα or ἐντολαί given over to them, and waiting for the quickening influence of the Spirit, Matt. xxviii. 20. Ὁ ἔχων καὶ τηρῶν is not one and the same by any means, so that ἔχων standing first should be equivalent to κατέχων; but the ἔχειν relates to the first essential condition that a person must have been already an external disciple of Jesus, and hearer and receiver of His words. The τηρεῖν, then, is not to be regarded as referring to perfect practical obedience; for how could that be made the preliminary condition for the receiving of the Holy Ghost?[1] But it is that believing-loving, loving-believing attention and regard to His words which springs from dependence of the heart upon Him; that which is again spoken of chap. xv. 20, the first μένειν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, chap. viii. 31. This first willing desire to keep avails in the sight of grace *as if* it were keeping in the fullest sense; such a man as would fain love although the words of ver. 28 must be spoken to him for his humbling, is dealt with as already an ἀγαπῶν. It will be more fully disclosed in ver. 23 what this loving and therefore being loved means; we must now single out with Judas the last great word by which the Lord offers all the fulness of God as contained in His own person—I will *manifest Myself* unto

[1] Thus the words of Augustine which Tholuck quotes, are incorrect in this connection, however otherwise true: Qui habet in memoria et servat in vita, qui habet in sermonibus et servat in moribus, qui habet audiendo et servat faciendo, qui habet faciendo et servat perseverando.

Hosted by Google

him![1] Beyond this, promise has nothing greater or higher for man; for this ἐμφανίζειν is indeed no mere making known or showing, but the indwelling of the Father and the Son, as follows in ver. 23, the goal already with which chap. xvii. 21–26 closes all. Nevertheless, this high promise is given without distinction to *every one* who hath and who regardeth the commandments of the Lord.

Instead of contentedly resting upon that love which here promised the fulness of its revelation to all everywhere in whom the response of dawning love was found; instead of sinking with heart and mind into the depths of this profound word; one of the disciples again interposes an objection. Whether Thomas, Philip, and lastly Judas, made these interruptions, simply because "the more thoughtful, profound, and greater Apostles, Peter, James, and John, kept silence," that is, felt less in them to object to (as Braune thinks)—appears to us exceedingly doubtful. For Peter's silence, at least, we have already found another reason; and the speaker appears to us to speak in the name of all, John possibly excepted. We have here the sole recorded word of Judas Lebbæus or Thaddæus. Niemeyer's Charakteristik notes here a very subtile trait in the Evangelist John, who at the mere mention of another with the same name is so affected by the remembrance of the fearful sin of Judas Iscariot, by himself most impressively recorded, that he cannot omit to warn against confounding the two. We leave this over-critical observation to its merits; more safe and more significant is another of Dräseke, that we never read concerning Iscariot that he entered in any way into his Master's words, that he ever put even a question of rash curiosity. It would be best of all, however, to say, that St John designs by this addition to intimate how even a *sincere* disciple did not yet apprehend the meaning of the Lord's word.

The world not—but ye! Jesus had never before made any such distinction, never before renounced, as it were, so plainly the acknowledgment of the world and His own revelation to it. This outrages the Jewish ideas of the Messiah and His expected kingdom, as held not only by Judas but by all the Apostles.

[1] Which Nonnus most unjustifiably limits to the Resurrection—*καὶ οἱ θέσκελον εἶδος ἐμοῦ χροὸς αὐτίκα δείξω.*

Hosted by Google

They are far from understanding as yet how much would follow from the principle that the *truth* of God must *sever* between those who receive it and those who reject it; that the *love* will be far from being found in all men, while only in connection with the response of love the entrance and abiding of God can take place, and the setting up of the kingdom become possible; they know not yet in what a great and sad reality a contradictory and excluded *world* must remain. Is not the Messiah a *King* of even the whole world? This is their dubious thought, as Luther still more strongly expresses it: "What kind of king will he be who will let no man see him, and spread his kingdom so silently and secretly that no man can see or know it, save the very few who love it?" Thus is it that only a handful in secret are to enjoy his hidden manifestation? Hence they are entangled in that foolish notion of a great, all-uniting kingdom of Christ which bewitches so many even in our own day, so that the pretensions of the little company make them go astray in the mass, and they devise every kind of Spirit and Christ besides to meet their views. Thus the disciples themselves are here somewhat like the unbelieving brethren, whose desire was, ch. vii. 4—*Show Thyself to the world!* The καὶ τί, if genuine, indicates (as ch. ix. 36) the zeal of the honest question—Ecquidnam factum est? Γέγονεν does not stand, as it has been superficially supposed, for γίνεται, or the whole formula for מַה הָיָה—How comes it then, how can this be? (In the Lond. Heb. N. T. אֵיךְ תִּהְיֶה זֹאת.) But Judas would say, as v. Gerlach keenly seizes it, *What has occurred?* We would translate it most simply, What then has *taken place*, that is, come between, that the world is now to be excluded from Thy manifestation? Although the Lord, ver. 17, had plainly said and given the reason—The world *cannot* receive the Spirit (as it comes not to the light of the word which prepares to that end, ch. iii. 19)—yet Judas had overlooked this, or forgotten it; and hence he proposes his question with an improper μέλλεις, which cannot otherwise be translated than as θέλεις. We have in his the type of all similar questions, which are constantly obtruded whenever the word is seen to be visibly fulfilled—The world seeth not and knoweth not the Spirit of the truth! The folly or despondency of men, alas, which

Hosted by Google

would have a greater and prematurely visibly great kingdom of the Lord Jesus, utters the question of Judas, which in him might be excused; and will not rest in the answer and decision. *Whoso* loveth Me—whoso *loveth* Me *not*—that is the test, and all comes to that! But *humility* also, which knows not its own poor love enough to ground its own election out of the world upon it, utters in a most blessed meaning, and with perfect propriety, the same question.[1]

Ver. 23. The Lord scarcely does more than repeat that which had appeared to the disciple so unintelligible or ungrounded that he was obliged to presuppose some not yet declared γέγονεν; yet the repetition is actually explanatory, since the decisive loving now in the answer takes the lead. And, further, the declaration is strengthened—And the Father will come with Me, we will make our abode with Him! *If any man love Me*—that is the great γέγονεν in every soul which is decisive for its deliverance from the present evil world (Gal. i. 4; Acts ii. 40). If Judas had known what the world is, and what *every* human heart by nature, he would rather have wondered how Jesus could reveal Himself to any man, in order to his perfect love and fidelity in the knowledge of the whole truth:—therefore the reply places this first; and that with an ἐάν τις (comp. ch. vii. 37) which seems to intimate the rareness of this love, while ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν afterwards seems to intimate what is the general rule. In Prov. viii. 17 the eternal wisdom of God, whose delight is to dwell with the children of men, lays down the same decisive condition—I love them that love Me; while the following clause—And those that seek Me early shall find Me, explains and unites these two—the first love of desire and the rewarding love of attainment. *On this principle* the Lord's words in vers. 15 and 21 should always have been explained, thus resolving the anomaly of the promise itself being made a condition. Is not this often apparent? No man can call Jesus a Lord but by the Holy Ghost; and again no man can receive the Holy Ghost but by calling upon the Lord for Him. It is self-understood, however, that our first calling, coming, and loving, can

[1] But this must not be so attributed to Judas as to make him mean: τι γέγονεν, what has been done *by us*, whereby have *we deserved* such especial prerogative?

Hosted by Google

by no means take place in our own strength and to our own praise; for He has previously offered Himself, invited and drawn our souls, exhibited and impressed His love upon us. How else could He say, If any man love *Me?* He is with us already, offers Himself beforehand for all, waits with seeking and desire on His part to find *who* will love Him in return. Once more: This first loving, which is the point of decision on our part, is the essential germ of life in living faith. If elsewhere and ordinarily the great test is believing or not believing, this is indeed only the same; but this last manner of speaking on the part of our Lord is more testing and convincing with respect to all who are already around Him as His disciples. "Love itself often includes (in John) the idea of faith, and is nothing but an acting faith, the breath or the life of faith." (Hamann.) Just so speaks Sartorius (Lehre v. d. heil. Leibe ii. 152), though his critic Schöberlein would complete his meaning, showing that he might have carried his argument further, and proved the nature of love to exist in faith itself. A theological or homiletic terminology which speaks of love in the place of faith may very easily degenerate into a false illuminist doctrine; but if the application be made in the right place it may be shown to have much truth. Nor is it right to say that this is the peculiarity of St John, for the Evangelist, and the Lord in his gospel, ever speaks most about believing, to the disciples and to the world; it should rather be ascribed to the closer and more internal character of these *last* discourses, and may be termed, as it were, *esoterical*, and in connection with this—for here is the test of all teaching concerning love—there could not be lacking the reference back to faith, as we find in ch. xiv. 1, 11, 12; xvi. 9, 27, 31. The Lord might have said, according to the analogy of ch. xiv. 21, He who loveth Me, he it is who believeth on Me. For valid faith is not a mere assent of the understanding, or obedient acceptance of the *word;* in the word the *person of the Lord* ever witnesses and offers itself:—consequently, what is wanting is a *personal response* and devotion of the heart, and that is the love in faith.[1] The

[1] "Faith lays hold of the love of God, and receives that love into the Spirit. It was such even in the Old Testament as it entered into the Divine revelations of love as far as they had been made." (Schöberlein.)

Hosted by Google

fulness of the love of God is manifested to us, attracts and moves us, in the personality of the *Son of man, worthy of supreme love;* how can it be but that our posture towards this person of Christ should declare and decide whether we are or are not susceptible and disposed to give admission to redeeming love. He who hateth Christ, hateth also His Father! (Ch. xv. 23.) There may be many who already in this sense *love* Him, who cannot yet call Him Lord by the Holy Ghost: despise not *that*, but wait till the Lord *shall* manifest Himself to such! "Honour every man, even the least, who has love to Christ in his heart!" This excellent rule out of Richter's Hausbibel tells very forcibly against much of our dogmatic rigour of requirement, against much of our bigoted ecclesiastical restriction. Learn better what *love* is, ye zealots, and make the banner of love to the Lord the sole banner of His Church! Zeller thus applies this saying to the subject of Christian instruction: "Thus even a *child* which has love to the Saviour is capable of the manifestation and indwelling of the Lord." Yes, assuredly, every childlike susceptible offering up of a loving heart receives perpetually and more and more living knowledge and experience as its reward. And the same holds good of the most advanced.

If a man love Me he *will* keep My words: thus the further condition laid down in vers. 15–21 becomes itself a first *promise*. Love only, and it will of itself thus follow! "The order seems reversed, but it is essentially one and the same either way"—preaches Schleiermacher. But let the difference of the expression in the two sentences be noted, and further that the latter fully explains the former. Λόγον instead of ἐντολάς teaches us, as we have said, that the full keeping of the law is not yet meant; although the ancient expositors mostly so understand it.[1] The word of Jesus speaks of repentance, coming, praying, believing: these are pre-eminently and first of all His commandments. He who willingly hears these, though it may be once and in one word, and retains and revolves Christ's word in His heart, being seized by its power; and then penitently comes, prays, believes so far as his early

The final unbelief in Christ which is ripe for condemnation, is "a heart closing itself against the highest love." (Jul. Müller, on Sin.)

[1] Gregory the Great, in particular, in a Pentecost sermon on this section.

Hosted by Google

weakness will allow him—is already a partaker of the first promise, and the second greater one will not fail him. Luther: "He will keep My words; that does not mean the word of Moses and the preaching of the law, but the preaching of love and grace such as He manifests to us." Such τηρεῖν may well consist with great lack of understanding, and much infirmity in action; if only that can be truly said which was said of the disciples, ch. xvii. 6–8, as preparatory to the coming Easter-day and day of Pentecost.[1] The testing question, Believest thou on the word of Jesus? still closer, on Jesus Himself? is, alas, answered by many prematurely in the affirmative. Then presses more closely and testingly the record, Lovest thou Him? Answer to this a confident Yes, only when thou dost experience the beginning and continuance of that which here follows—the keeping of His word!

Now comes the rewarding love for such as thus love, in its full communion or manifestation. The Father's will is that His Son, and Himself in the Son, should be loved; and where He finds the beginning of this, oh how He returns that love, for He will and He can now shed abroad the fulness of His Divine complacency! That Jesus loves them that love Him, has been already seen in ver. 21; now it is further shown that assuredly *the Father* also, yea properly the Father through Him, will love them. *Will* love? Has He not already first loved, and that, according to ch. iii. 16, even the whole world? This universal love of compassion, previous to all our willing, running, loving, keeping, is to be strictly distinguished from the especial love of His approval. The Father loves all sinners, therefore sends He and gives to them the Son—all heathens, therefore must the Gospel be preached to them—all so-called Christians, therefore He bears with them and allures them with so much long-suffering patience; but He specially loves only those who love His Son in faith, and it is to them that His love gives the Spirit, and to them He *comes*. (Ch. xvi. 27.)

Less and Semler gave forth formerly an insipid interpreta-

[1] For which we should wait with sincere patience, if need be, as Oetinger (Evang.-Predigt. S. 388) exhorts beginners to hold fast the word, and not, before the Spirit of God comes into the soul, to strike sparks for themselves with flint and steel,—Isa. l. 10, 11.

Hosted by Google

tion, which would remove the mystery of the *μονή* and the *unio mystica: καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα,* and *We,* that is, I and you My beloved disciples, will *one day* (according to vers. 2, 3) come *to the Father* and take up our abode with Him![1] Oh no, this *dwelling* of God with men, that is *in their hearts,* where *love* is and to which the *Spirit* comes, is the New Testament fulfilment of all the promises which have referred to this, from Lev. xxvi. 11 down to Ezek. xxxvii. 27, xxxvi. 27. "Heaven and earth, the palaces of all kings and Cæsars, cannot give a dwelling to God; but with men, who keep His word, will He make His abode. Although Isaiah calls heaven His throne and earth His footstool, he calls them not His dwelling."[2] This is the *mystery* of the שְׁכִינָה of which the wise in Israel know how to speak and the foolish to babble. This is no *figure,* but the most essential truth.[3] Further, the Lord distinguishes the *coming* from this *abiding.* With the sincere this latter is the certain consequence; but in the case of the insincere, who keep not the words which they know, there may be many visitations, which end not in permanent indwelling. As, according to Acts xvii. 28, the power of God naturally dwells and works in and around us, so also His Spirit, His love, His holy life. As sin dwells in our hearts as a home; so does the new love which casts it out, which is shed abroad by the Holy Ghost, and conquers all. (Rom. v. 5, viii. 37–39.) It is clear in itself that the Lord speaks of the coming and indwelling of the *Spirit;* He was previously included, and when the Son unites Himself with the Father in this wondrous *We,* an internal fellowship with the *Triune God* is promised. For that purpose we have here, but once only, the bold expression—a *coming* even of the *Father.*[4]

[1] Klee says, unhappily: this *might* be so understood. He does not consider, apart from the connection (according to which *μονὴν ποιεῖν* must correspond to the *ἐμφανίζειν*), how inconsistent such a uniting *We* would be, and the *ποιήσομεν* as applied to believers equally with Christ.

[2] Luther's Tischreden i. 54.

[3] Hezel: "Figure does not explain anything clearly; and we ought not to speculate much about the indwelling of God in man, as our dogmatists and preachers used to do. Children only play with figures."

[4] This last, again, is significant against Luthardt's narrow *eschatological* reference even of this coming to the "goal of all history," Rev. xxi. 3—

Hosted by Google

Ver. 24. He that loveth *Me not*—a horrendum dictu for every man who knoweth Him! In sorrowful gentleness expressed—Not to love the Loveliest, the most worthy of all love, yea Love itself! But it is essentially *to hate*, for there is no neutrality in the plain truth of God, which everywhere makes the decisive separation: hence even in Ex. xx. 5, 6, there is but this alternative. Assuredly, thou must either love or hate Christ; for to decline or ignore His word altogether, when it comes to thee, and especially His cross, is utterly impossible. All semblance of indifference is merely semblance. So also the οὐ τηρεῖν of the words of our Lord is essentially an ἀθετεῖν (Lu. x. 16), a fearful contempt and casting behind of what is nevertheless heard. "Knowledge and conscience of all men must admit that nothing can be more beautiful, nothing more consistent and harmonious, nothing more reasonable, than the doctrine of Jesus understood and proclaimed in honest words and without human artifice." (Oetinger.) Yea, *heart* and conscience must submit to the influence of the drawing, supplicating love of God—yet there is no loving, no holding fast and keeping of the word of eternal love! Before, it was τὸν λόγον, now significantly τοὺς λόγους, because unbelief does not embrace in their unity the individual sayings, but dismisses them as they are isolated. The disciples hear in all words One Word, and that, as He frequently testified, not as His own words only, but as the Father's who sent Him. But it is this which the person μὴ ἀγαπῶν in the world will not believe, although the Father hath actually sent to him the Son who speaks directly to him.—Thus the answer of Jesus for Judas and all disciples (which enlargement of the address lies already in the ἀκούετε) would put the counter-question—Does the world then *love* Me? Will the world suffer itself to be loved, or even instructed? *Can* I manifest Myself to it, to it which *cannot* receive the Spirit? The knowledge of the truth first cannot be enforced, simply because

which on all grounds is utterly untenable. Is not the individual here spoken of, as opposed to the world; and does not the whole chapter speak of *that* coming which coincides with the coming of the Spirit? If this young teacher had been a preacher he would not have taken away from the pulpit this *Pentecost* subject, and opposed the ecclesiastical selection of the Gospel, here if anywhere appropriate!

Hosted by Google

a corresponding love of the heart is requisite. But to love is evidently something altogether free, and God's kingdom in Christ will have no other subjects than such as thus voluntarily love; it therefore renounces beforehand the *world* as such.

"And thus has the Lord (says Lange) set aside the *three main stumbling-blocks* which, having their origin in worldly confusion, darken the disciples' apprehension of the coming time." He means—without giving sufficiently precise definitions of them—the offence of the morbid doubter Thomas, ver. 5, who will *know* all with the understanding; that of the doubter Philip, eager for manifestations, to whom only a *visible* Theophany of the Father, a sign, sufficeth; finally, that of the doubter Judas (not Iscariot) holding friendship with the world, who would too readily receive the whole world into the kingdom of God.

THE HOLY GHOST, ONCE MORE, AS TEACHER AND REMEMBRANCER; THE PEACE LEFT BEHIND, AND GIVEN ANEW THROUGH HIS DEPARTURE TO THE GREATER FATHER; THE POWERLESSNESS OF THE PRINCE OF THE WORLD IN HIS AGGRESSION UPON HIM.

(Chap. xiv. 25–31.)

In this preliminary conclusion the Lord, still deferring to close His words, and ever beginning anew, returns back to the commencement of His whole discourse. As if He had already spoken all, He nevertheless continues to speak. He now refers again in plain words to His *departure* to the Father, after which the Comforter will come and make all things plain to their understanding. Then as a *farewell* He speaks of the *peace*, which in a certain sense He bequeathes and leaves to them, but which He will be able to give in its fulness when He goes to His greater Father, and becomes Himself greater than now in His humiliation, in which in the obedience of suffering He overcomes the world's prince.

Vers. 25, 26. Luther: "These are simply last words, which our Lord gives to His disciples as the close and seal of His preaching and consolation, because He is about to separate from

Hosted by Google

them; as if He would say, I have been hitherto with you, and have given you My word, and comforted you with My own lips, that ye may keep yourselves when I am removed from you. And it is true that the comfort of the words which I have spoken is excellent, great, and high; but because I am still with you they do not so go to your hearts that ye can enjoy the sweetness and power of them; *ye think only that it is I who am speaking such words.*"—Assuredly, as Tholuck says, "It appears as if Christ was disposed here to arise from the table and end His sayings"—but it only *appears* so, and He Himself probably knew that and how much He would speak.[1] We must attribute to the soul of Jesus an altogether human affection of heart here; His words begin anew and are prolonged on and on, as takes place at all important farewells; and the "I go now" may have been more than once uttered. Only *in the Spirit* He is sublimely elevated above all this,—and as often as He begins afresh to speak of the *departure* which filled His soul, new words ever offer themselves to His conscious will, and these He must speak. B.-Crusius, therefore, quite incorrectly terms what follows, vers. 25–31, "detached consolatory sayings, in the language of feeling, not new and not connected!" Rather shall we find in every verse a distinctively new thought, not simply poured out from feeling to feeling:—as we have endeavoured to show in our preparatory analysis.

Λελάληκα neither here nor at chap. xv. 11, xvi. 1, 4, 6, 25, 33, stands simply instead of λαλῶ: it springs from that pervading farewell feeling, and is parallel with the εἴρηκα of ver. 29. It *first of all* refers in each instance of its occurrence to what had just been said; and consequently here to the sayings which had been unintelligible to the disciples since ver. 2; especially to the exclusion of the world from His manifestation. But this does not hinder us from supposing the Lord in these final utterances to contemplate the conclusion *of all His discourses with*

[1] We could not say, at least, with Schleiermacher: "As He closes (afterward ver. 31) with, Arise let us go hence! it appears that humanly He knew not whether afterwards on the way, and as long as His disciples were with Him, He would be strong enough to speak further with them, or whether He would not in silence wait for the final issues of His earthly destiny."

Hosted by Google

the disciples, comprehending the whole course of them from the beginning. We, must not however, with B.-Crusius regard this as the sole meaning, and make *ταῦτα* His *λόγοι*, *ἐντολαί* (vers. 24, 21)—but rather, *Herewith*, with *these* last-spoken words, My speaking, teaching, discoursing have an end. That we ought not to exclude the general glance back upon the past, is shown by the *παρ' ὑμῖν μένων* which embraces the whole period of His visible presence, in connection with the immediately following contrast, in which it more plainly follows, *πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν*.

When He now once again points to that Other in His place, the abiding One, He introduces Him by a third, and that His most plain and intelligible name—*the Holy Ghost*. He *connects* now, for its fullest illustration, this well-known term with the mysteriously sounding *Paraclete* which had been first used, after having formed a transition for it in the middle by "*Spirit* of the truth." The Father will *send* Him, just as (ver. 24) He has *sent* the Son (comp. Gal. iv. 4, 6)—this is an expression appropriate only to personality, and one which, to speak now simply and unspeculatively, places the "Holy Ghost" as the Third in order with the Father and the Son, just as it is finally in Matt. xxviii. 19. The *ἐκεῖνος*, corresponding with the *ἄλλος*, has been defrauded of its force in the argument, by the remark that it refers only to the name *παράκλητος*; but that of itself is not true, since *τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ πέμψει* has intervened, and in ch. xvi. 13, 14, the same *ἐκεῖνος* stands quite removed from *παράκλητος*, while it is strikingly linked to the *τὸ πνεῦμα*. And is not the personal official name, in equality with the person of Jesus, of itself decisive? He who can regard all the therewith connected personal expressions (of teaching, reminding, testifying, coming, convincing, guiding, speaking, hearing, prophesying, taking) in these three chapters as being no other than a long drawn out figure, deserves not to be recognised even as an interpreter of intelligible words, much less as an expositor of Holy Scripture. There is a certain propriety in referring to the after-coming of the Spirit when Jesus had gone, the analogy of lower things in which "the teacher is honoured when he is gone from us; *his word remains behind as influential spirit*, and stands detached from the earthly accidents of its author, as a legacy which is so to speak glori-

Hosted by Google

fied."[1] Thus in the case of Christ Himself His sensible presence stood in the way of the disclosure of His Spirit, and the full understanding of His words; *because* He was with them and stood before them, they could not apprehend Him. But the relations of His person and doctrine pass beyond the region of all analogy here; for it is not simply the word left behind which becomes spirit, but, as we remarked before, at this point He *distinguishes* most decisively the new and superadded *teacher* from the *words* which Himself had spoken.

The Father will send Him *in My name:* this is not exhausted when we expound, "upon the supplication, through the mediation, of the Son, when we pray for the Spirit in His name." But as the Son, according to ch. v. 43, is come *in the Father's name* (we must ever take the phraseology of the Lord Jesus in consistency with itself), that is, as sent from the Father, proceeding from Him, and in such a sense that the Father wholly worketh, liveth, and is in the Son—so similarly the Spirit sent from the Father comes at the same time as not only *prayed for* by the Son, but *sent* by Him (hence ch. xv. 26), and in such a manner that the Son Himself is and comes in Him. Thus Meyer says, correctly—As My Representative; which, moreover, lies plainly in the immediate connection, for *instead of* the Teacher who did not *remain*, who has now *spoken* His words, this Teacher will fulfil the work. The Spirit of God is at the same time the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of the Son. (Rom. viii. 9; Gal. iv. 6.) The διδάξει καὶ ὑπομνήσει will thus be rightly understood in its depth of meaning! That the former word does not immediately refer to ἃ εἶπον, but that the first πάντα involves an independent and wider meaning—*All things* which yet can and must be taught, which ye still need to know, concerning which ye would desire when I am gone to question and hear Me—is perfectly true, and is confirmed by the πάντα (1 Jno. ii. 20, 27), as also by the *leading into all truth*, ch. xvi. 13. But this still-remaining teaching is not anything altogether new; the Son had already told them *all things*, which ch. xvi. 14, 15 prevents us from overlooking. Tholuck takes a very superficial view of the combined expressions; he is almost cor-

[1] As v. Meyer says, without any Rationalist spirit in this comparison with Christ, in his beautiful "Trost für Lehrer und Vorsteher."

Hosted by Google

rect in his first limitation of the πάντα to the "hard things and those of His words which the disciples had not apprehended."[1] But he then goes on to say of the ὑπομιμνήσκειν,—That which is not understood is all the more easily forgotten, but the Spirit could not inwardly unfold in instruction what was not at least in the remembrance; consequently, He would "*also* revive that which had faded out of their memory." It opposes this too external view of the bringing to remembrance that the πάντα ἃ εἶπον is connected also with that; but the disciples could not possibly *forget* all His discourses, and the Lord could never have made this a supposable case. Here Lücke is right (with Augustin, Beda, Rupert): "the teaching and bringing to remembrance are not distinct methods of the Spirit's instruction,—only completing or only continuing their instruction—but both are inseparably one in spirit." Not, therefore, with Theophylact: "He taught what Christ did not teach, because they could not receive it; He brought to remembrance what He had spoken, but what the disciples could not retain in memory because they understood it not." (Similarly, Theod. Mops., and Euthymius.) But the second clause in our Lord's words *explains* and *restricts* the first by a vau exegeticum; the ground of which lies in the unuttered middle-term—that He Himself had actually said *all things* in their essential principle, just as in chap. xvi. 13, 14. Think not that I promise you *altogether new* teaching and manifestations of the Paraclete.[2] His teaching will be no more than a bringing to remembrance. "The Holy Spirit should *say over* again to them what of His words they had *forgotten and had not understood.* So diligently had the Lord provided against the possibility of man's law being established in His church, that He had seen fit to say all things before, even though not at once observed and understood." (Luther, Antwort auf das Buch Emser's.) Fikenscher's opinion

[1] But we would go a little deeper:—the inmost kernel of His doctrine, with all things not in them κατὰ τὸ ῥητὸν, but to be deduced and developed from it.

[2] The perversion of this, after the Mohammedan or fanatical style, would make Heb. i. 1, 2, run differently: "and after He had spoken not yet perfectly by His Son, He continues now to speak by His Spirit, though not yet His *last* words."

Hosted by Google

is philologically unfounded, that *ὑπομιμνήσκειν*, in *distinction* from *ἀναμιμνήσκειν*, refers to the entering into the depth and essence of the words, to the estimating and weighing of what they had heard; on the other hand, it is quite certain that the *two* expressions indicate not merely the recalling of something properly forgotten, but in many cases also the hortatory impressing of what was well known in word, thus first bringing it to their understanding. What I altogether apprehend I may be said to know. Thus *ὑπομιμνήσκειν* is here equivalent to our Erinnern,[1] in the pregnant and deep sense, "not merely to call back the words to their remembrance, but to open to them the words which they had heard, but which had remained obscure, to disclose with undeceiving clearness the meaning of the sayings of Jesus." (v. Gerlach.) It must be understood, at the same time, that all this does not exclude that actual reviving in the memory which is the foundation of the word and of the idea, and of which this gospel itself is an example.

Further, this bringing to remembrance includes exhortation to faith and the keeping of Christ's word, to the obedience of His precepts. On account of our weakness or our sinfulness, we forget, alas, the most familiar words just where they should be remembered, and there is always need that one should stand behind us ready to pronounce our duty in our ears. And this office, according to Isa. xxx. 20, 21, is assumed by the Teacher, who is always internally present and will no more depart,—and the *suggeret* of the Vulg. (though not enough) well suits this meaning. All this is here included; but the comprehensive ground-idea is the unity of teaching and reminding in order to perfect understanding, faith, and obedience. Whenever the disciples had to say in after time, Alas we cannot now think of this or that, what He then said and how He said it—then might they call upon the Reminder on the ground of the promise which they had received. If they had to cry,—Alas, we know it well, but we do not fully understand it—then came in the Teacher, and what they then understood, they now first held and obeyed aright. If they might think, On this subject

[1] Braune popularly applies the German word thus—"that it would work internally, livingly, clearly, and mightily in them—that is erinnern, Erinnerung."

Hosted by Google

the Lord never spoke any direct word—the Spirit would show them in the ground of some saying, as in the spirit of the collective doctrine of Jesus, the germ and the test for all further necessary and possible truth. (1 Cor. vii. 25, 40.) For assuredly in the school of the Holy Ghost there is no ceasing to learn; nor was there even for Apostles. Bengel: "Nor, however, even subsequently, were the whole of the dogmas of Christian truth infused in one mass into the Apostles' minds; but as they needed them, and as occasion suggested, the Paraclete gave them instruction." The Fut. διδάξει καὶ ὑπομνήσει applies progressively to all futurity.

Therefore will we, dear readers, not scorn, in relation to babes and beginners in the school of Christ, the receiving and the keeping of even the word not understood, the τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον spoken of before, which for us all stands first as the condition. For "he who has not been the subject of an earnest desire to hear and keep the *word*, has nothing in him which the *Spirit* shall *bring to remembrance*, has nothing in him for the Spirit to set in clearer light." (Rieger.) But that all may not end with ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν—it is for us to *permit the Spirit to teach us again* all which Jesus has taught, that the seed may attain its full growth, that we may be properly mindful of both the known and the neglected sayings, letting them bear the right fruit in the right place, in living intelligence and obedience, and bearing our living testimony to their power.—The blessed disciples appear so far to have understood the great promise of ver. 26, that they are preparatorily encouraged with regard to the obscurity of these as well as all the sayings of the Lord, and thus they *ask no more questions;* when in ch. xvi. 16 they are tempted to do so once more, they bethink themselves and suppress the desire.

Ver. 27. Probably after a short pause which allowed them time to reflect upon the consoling promises referring to the Holy Ghost, the Lord proceeds further with the *farewell* which had already begun in the λελάληκα παρ' ὑμῖν μένων. As at the final conclusion, ch. xvi. 33, He speaks of *peace;* this parallel shows us that He connects a very full meaning with this word, even as we are assured, independently of that, that our Lord never uttered a word as a mere formula or phrase, or used expressions half emptied of their meaning. But we know also by many ex-

Hosted by Google

amples that He by no means scorns to adopt the usual forms of conversation in life: He elevates them to His own level, illustrates their original truth, or sets them in a new light. This makes it probable to us that we shall find in His departing discourses some such *glorification of a popular farewell greeting*, an *adieu* spoken to the disciples. Now the "farewell" in Israel, as the greeting of love in coming and in going generally, was the שָׁלוֹם לָךְ or שָׁלוֹם לָכֶם—and we have already seen upon Matt. x. 13, Lu. x. 5, how the Lord reinstates this greeting in its true meaning. When we find, and in St John too, that the risen Lord entered the circle of the disciples with *Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν* (comp. *χαίρετε*, Matt. xxviii. 9, but Lu. xxiv. 36, *εἰρήνη* also)—it is very obvious that we must connect this, as the Lord Himself designed, with the שָׁלוֹם לָכֶם which He had spoken as His departing farewell. Gesenius, indeed, to whom Lücke appeals, is quite right in saying that this formula is not yet found in the Old Testament as a *mere* greeting, as it was afterwards among the Arabians and Syrians, and in the Talmud, but always has an emphatic meaning in it, as the actual invocation of good upon a person, exhortation not to fear, etc.; but the reason of this is partly that nothing of the conventional language of conversation is there communicated, and partly that such phraseology was formed and fixed in *later* days, established, however, in the time of Christ. If it be said that the expression never occurs, at least, as a *farewell*, it may be replied that any greeting may be so used, especially such as circumstances make peculiarly suitable. Moreover, we may compare (with Lücke) as certainly the *germ* of such farewell-formula the O. T. לֵךְ לְשָׁלוֹם as early as Gen. xliii. 23; Ex. iv. 18, and again 1 Sam. i. 17, xx. 42; 2 Kings v. 19; בְּשָׁלוֹם, 1 Sam. xxix. 7; 2 Sam. xv. 9, with which such passages in the New Testament as Mar. v. 34; Lu. vii. 50, viii. 48; Acts xvi. 36; Jas. ii. 16 well agree, and even in the Epistles, 1 Pet. v. 14; 3 Jno. 15. Thus we have on the whole ground enough for taking the expression *Εἰρήνην ἀφίημι ὑμῖν* in our Lord's lips as *first of all* a Valete or Farewell. Luther: "These are the last words, as of one who is going away and gives his good-night or his blessing."

But how is this touching expression, reduced in the world to an empty word and become a lie, *glorified* into its highest truth!

Hosted by Google

The New Testament εἰρήνη has been seldom profoundly enough traced to its Old Testament derivation in שָׁלוֹם, whose place it takes; it is too generally limited to the ordinary meaning of peace. Herder reduced our precious saying, *My peace* I give unto you —into the assurance that "with His mind (His Spirit!) they should also have that imperturbable *tranquillity of spirit* which they had ever seen in Him, and now discerned even in this time of distress"[1]—but our readers will hardly approve of this or think it enough. Kling, too (S. u. K. 1836. 3. 685), falls, though with a good intention, somewhat into this tone: "After He had consoled them as it regards their hitherto defective *knowledge*, He proceeds to tell them that their *temper and feelings* also should lack no stay when He had gone." He takes εἰρήνη more definitely than Lücke, as "the good estate of a mind united with God." We think, on the other hand, that this is by no means enough, but merely its *internal* aspect, the essential ground, indeed, and beginning of the Messiah's *salvation*, which we with Lücke understand to be signified. Not merely here trouble and fear, but in ch. xvi. 33, θλῖψις too forms the antithesis. Luther hits the point with perfect correctness: "No man has peace unless things are with him as they should be. Therefore in the Hebrew tongue this little word *peace* means nothing else but *thriving and prospering*." In fact this is the root and ground-meaning of שָׁלוֹם, as appears plain in many passages, especially in that normal one, Isa. liii. 5. We repeat what has been said in another place.[2] שָׁלוֹם is originally the adjective form גָּדוֹל of the root שלם, integrum esse; whence שָׁלֵם, thus, unhurt, *whole*, *entire*, when a thing is what it should be according to its origin and capacity, without any deduction, need, sickness, hurt, unhappiness, or disturbance. Hence שִׁלֵּם to complete, restore, replace that which is wanting to a thing. This fundamental meaning of שָׁלוֹם (Cocceii Lex. incolumitas, res salvæ, pax, in quâ est ὁλοκληρία, comp. Gen. xliv. 17, Ex. iv. 18, LXX.) is here—Isa. liii.—distinctively intended, as is proved by the parallel with נִרְפָּא and חֳלָיֵנוּ נָשָׂא. Compare שָׁלוֹם as *healing*, Jer. vi. 14, viii. 11, xiv. 17–19, xxxiii. 6–9; Ps. xxxviii. 4–8, as completeness (building), Ezek. xiii. 10–16. But let us not be misunderstood! We

[1] Bahrdt also uses the unhappy word *tranquillity of mind*.

[2] Andeutungen für gl. Schriftv. ii. 113.

Hosted by Google

would not deny by all this that the peace, or the rest of *the heart*, and conscience *through* the peace or the atonement, restored fellowship *with God*, as it afterwards appears in apostolical teaching, is an essential element, yea, as before said, the first ground and beginning of all εἰρήνη; but we must maintain that this word, which has come from the sacred idiom of the old covenant, embraces more than this, even the whole *salvation* of man, his *re-establishment* into final perfect external and internal *well-being*.[1] Hence we are really referred to eternity for the enjoyment of the consummate peace. If here the Lord in His farewell *attaches* His word to the common greeting (which certainly itself speaks, with the same generality, of well-being), He also proceeds to refer to the *Messianic promise*, according to which שָׁלוֹם in all the depth and fulness of the word is the good and salvation which the Prince of peace gives in His kingdom of peace. It was, indeed, long before the Apostles and His disciples, before the whole church of His believers should enjoy this full and perfect peace; but the pledge meanwhile, yea, in a certain sense, the compensation for it is assuredly the *inward peace* of a heart no longer disturbed or fearful, because united with God. Therefore He speaks of that *immediately*, and that is the truth in the first-named exposition, which does not however exhaust the further-pointed promissory meaning of the word. At the final return of the Lord to His own, of which the return of the risen Saviour was a type, when they altogether *live* as and where He liveth, will the *peace be unto you* be fulfilled in all its amplitude.

My peace—this also means very much: The peace which I Myself have, which I already possess in My suffering way as pledge and equivalent, because I am going to the Father into the peace and blessedness of glory; which hence I alone can give; which in its truth and fulness is actually something altogether new, and first brought unto men by Me; which, finally, I can give and impart only through fellowship with Myself, to all in whom I dwell and abide. (Comp. *My joy in you*, ch. xv. 11.) Yet let us take notice that the Lord adds this τὴν ἐμήν first to the second clause with δίδωμι; and learn therefrom that the first *peace* without the article with its ἀφίημι cannot possibly be the same.

[1] Luthardt, correctly: Εἰρήνη is not a matter of feeling, pre-eminently, but a *condition*.

Hosted by Google

He who takes the two clauses as only parallel formulæ does not interpret aright, for what the Lord already *leaves behind* Him cannot be at the same time *given*—that is, if we take as we must the δίδωμι as a δώσω belonging to the promise of the Spirit. Lange would make it a mere repetition of the farewell salutation as at the same time an assurance of permanent fellowship and speedy meeting again; but that issues in the end in such a two-fold meaning as must *here*, by the nature of the case, have a special significance. So with Lampe: He not only speaks twice about peace, but with a difference. For concerning the former peace He only speaks generally, the latter He precisely names *His own;* He leaves the *former*, the latter He gives. But not with the distinction of Augustin and Gregory: The former the peace of grace upon earth, the latter the peace of glory in heaven. Nor *merely*, as Lampe rejecting this, prefers—first, the lesser peace of the Old Testament, then the full New Testament peace. There is indeed something of truth in this, if we place ourselves in the position of the disciples as coming from the Old Testament, and the antithetical *My* almost leads that way; nevertheless, the disciples had also already received through Jesus a certain elevation of the Old Testament spiritual experience or peace of heart; and what they now had He leaves to them undisturbed and unchanged by His departure. It is at least not His fault, He would say, if they let this peace be disturbed, it ought and it might *remain* with them. Fikenscher: "Jesus took not away the repose of His disciples with Him"—but less correctly again: "He *gave* them rather (better, He promised to give) of *His* peace." He then excellently expounds, "He of you who feels himself blessed in Me, shall not lose his peace; no, I will still give to you through My Spirit, who will come to you, of *that* peace which is to be the peculiar possession of the righteous and of those called by God unto glory." Let us reflect, finally, that this gradation for the disciples is still repeated among believers, when their hearts are troubled first, and then the Lord comes to them again in His Spirit; and that interpretation of the difference between the *leaving* and the *giving* is right and important, which Fresenius gives: The first and lesser degree is the peace which is left, when the principle of the Divine peace which we had previously received from

Hosted by Google

Him is not given up in the time of pressure and trial, but held firm in the heart. The higher degree is when the peace of Jesus with a sensible joy of the Holy Ghost is truly and properly given *anew*.

Not as the world giveth! This is an affectionate ratification of the word. Kling is right in maintaining (after Lampe) that this καθώς (as) must be referred not to the substance of the peace, but to the *manner of giving* it; for this suits the letter of the expression. That the world has its peace and even *gives* it, is given to be understood only in mournful irony. It *heals the hurt* lightly (mark again the fundamental idea of שָׁלוֹם) and says peace, peace, when there is no peace. (Jer. vi. 14, viii. 11, xiv. 13, xxiii. 17; Ezek. xiii. 10.) *Its* greetings and good wishes are *empty forms of speech* without any actual giving. Its peace secured by policy and arms is not really such, as the old proverb runs—Public peace is not to be trusted. Still less the world's peace of heart. Their deluded tranquillity is followed again by the outbreak of anguish; with all their giving of peace there is no security against amazement and fear of heart. But the Lord alone adds to His שָׁלוֹם in full truth the אַל תִּירָא or אַל תִּירְאוּ which so often accompanies the word in the Old Testament.[1] Bengel refers the μὴ ταρασσέσθω to any terror from without, δειλιάτω to fears from within (comp. 2 Cor. vii. 5)—but this will not very well agree with ver. 1, where certainly internal disquiet was intended. Thus it is better to understand a progression, the former being the less, the latter the greater trouble; since δειλία, still more than φόβος, always stands with a bad meaning. Ye need not even be disquieted, if ye have My peace; much less need ye be amazed. Or, further, the δειλιᾷν is the ground of the ταρασσέσθαι, and as such is removed.

By this, *His* εἰρήνη, the Lord, who had already spoken of the difference between the *world* and His disciples, now gives the last most sure and perfectly decisive *note* of this distinction: His own have peace in Him (although because of their infirmity and before the consummation they have tribulation in the world)—

[1] Luthardt corrects Kling and myself: "It is not that the reality and the *empty word* are here opposed, but the truth and the *deceitful appearance* of peace." As if both were not the same, as we have said above! This is hairsplitting for the sake of correction.

Hosted by Google

and this may finally be made by every man a most internal test. Indeed, it is one thing to have this inmost peace, and it is another to have a joyful sense or knowledge of it; as we see in the case of these disciples to whom the Lord ascribes a peace almost in spite of themselves. Nevertheless, there was a peace which the world did not and could not give in the hearts of Mary and John under the cross, or they could not have been there. The peace of God in Christ is higher than all understanding, *ὑπερέχουσα πάντα νοῦν*, higher than all *words* about it, and deeper than all *consciousness* of it. As the power of the peace-giving of Jesus among the disciples followed and overcame all at a *later* time, so it is often with ourselves; that is, if we, like the sincere disciples, are among those to whom the thrice-uttered word was given. *To you* I leave and give peace. The leaving is always followed by the giving, as Lange says, "Out of the farewell salutation soon springs a new resurrection greeting."

Ver. 28. With that marvellous elevation of *His* peace above the amazement of these perplexed and weak-believing disciples which pervades these farewell discourses, and is here especially prominent, He demands from them that they even *rejoice* at His going away. More strictly speaking, He does not require it of them, because He knows what is in their hearts, but He *tells* them, in order that such a transcendent word may in some degree at least assuage their sorrow, that they would rejoice *if they loved Him* aright! Oh, how must this have penetrated their hearts! That they love Him He knows, He already assumed it in vers. 15, 21, 23, confirms it again down to chap. xvi. 27—and yet now He says *εἰ ἠγαπᾶτε* instead of the previous *ἐὰν ἀγαπᾶτε*. This is not hard of solution: Their love is not yet the true and perfect love, it is not yet *disinterested* enough in its faith and dependence upon His person; they still think too much of their own bereaved condition, instead of elevating themselves to His joy, which all His words however testify, and thinking upon *His* departure *to the Father*. So far we agree with Kling, that in our Lord's meaning they should rejoice at this *pre-eminently on His own account:*—what Lücke objects has not much force. The connection with ver. 27 is regarded as not permitting this sense, and *ἐχάρητε ἄν* is repre-

Hosted by Google

sented as being only the positive expression of μὴ ταρασσέσθω μηδὲ δειλιάτω. But the connection with the previous verse is really that of a *progression*, by which He would *elevate* them above themselves and their own fate to the consideration of His own glorification; and, again, neither was the trouble of the disciples *merely* on their own account, nor finally does the Lord require it of them that they rejoice exclusively on His.

Ye have indeed *heard* that I *said* unto you—a stronger expression than the simple *I say unto you;* for He would thereby intimate that they had not yet heard it aright. In the consolatory καὶ ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς immediately joined to the mournful ὑπάγω, He sums up, as it were, the several promises of vers. 3, 18, 21, 23. All this consequently would be cause of joy *on their own account.* But this has not availed them as yet; the solitary ὑπάγω has prevented the entrance of these assurances, exciting only gloomy thoughts of death; *therefore* the Lord now suddenly turns to the application of the other side of the question—I have *further told you* that I go to the Father![1] and that must be, as for you, so especially *for Me,* something simply good and to be rejoiced in, and if ye loved Me with an absolute love ye would in the thought of My elevation at first forget yourselves. This order of thought, which to us at least is clear and certain, gives at once the true meaning of the celebrated μείζων as spoken of the Father—a word upon which the ancient and modern heretics (to use the words of Dorner after Irenæus), like base wrestlers, seize spasmodically, as if it were an individual limb of the truth.

Luther put it rightly: "Now mark that the question here treated is not as to whether and how Christ is God or man, or what His nature and essence is, whether in this He is greater or less than the Father; but He is telling them that they should not be *terrified*—and adds these words as a reason, that He is going *to the Father.* The question is not now about His being born of the Father, but of *His receiving His Father's kingdom,*

[1] We firmly believe that the omission of εἶπον before παρεύομαι sprang from a false scruple about the repetition of the word. To us, the repetition is in the highest degree appropriate in connection with the humbling ἠκούσατε. I have not merely *said* ὑπάγω, but also *I go to the Father*—that, too, ye have heard Me say.

Hosted by Google

in which He will be equal with the Father, and be known and honoured in like majesty. Therefore do I go, He saith, thither *where I shall be greater than I now am*, that is to the Father—and it is better that I should pass *out of this obscurity and weakness* (in which He moves, since He must suffer and die) into the *power and glory* in which the Father is." Similarly Calvin: "Christ does not here compare the Divinity of the Father with His own, nor His own human nature with the Divine essence of the Father; but rather His present condition with the celestial glory to which He would presently be received, as if He would say: Ye desire to retain Me in the world, though it is better for Me to ascend into heaven." So, further, Cocceius: "An inferiority as to His human nature is not here intended, because an inferiority is referred to which is to be removed by His departure to the Father."

Quite inappropriate also is all that the fathers have said, whether in opposition to heretics or without this occasion, for the closer understanding of this *greater*—referring it to a permanent relation between the Divine persons. We cannot at all see how such a thought could have arisen here.[1] *Greater than I*, who nevertheless am greater than all, One with the Father, so that He is seen in Me—this very *paradox*, which exalts Him who speaks so high, necessarily requires the explanation, the restriction "*for the present*, in a certain sense." That the saying would otherwise "say nothing" at such time, Brückner may well assert with Hilgenfeld whom he quotes. It is evident that the Son speaks in His undivided person generally; and here especially inasmuch as He now placed Himself in antithesis to the Father. To speak *in such manner* of a pre-eminence in Divine *dignity*, which would be self-understood, would not evidence humility, but be in the highest degree inappropriate. Roos: "What subject would say to His friends—Ye should rejoice because I am going to the Prince, for the Prince is greater than I?"[2] We make it stronger: What man as man would say—God is

[1] In Petavius de Trin. lib. 2, cap. 2, we have them collected: similarly in Suiceri Thesaur. Eccles. ii. 1368. Either, according to Alexander against Arius, the Father as ἀγέννητος or as Father is greater; or, the Son is less only according to His human nature, which latter Gerhard labours hard to prove.

[2] Glaubenslehre, § 237, comp. Lehre Jesu Christi, S. 176.

Hosted by Google

greater than I!!![1] Thus also that is ever impossible—According to My humanity I am indeed less! Moreover, He speaks of an inferiority *to be laid aside, to be removed;* else would there be no ground for the ἐχάρητε ἄν in the whole discourse. If (as Schmieder on the High-priestly Prayer teaches) the Father is mentioned here as greater than the Son quite independently of His incarnation, and simply by reason of the character of subordination in the eternal Sonship, there can be found no connection or order of thought in this discourse on such a view. The Father *sent* Him into the world, and now in the obedience of this mission, in the *doing as the Father gave Him commandment*, ver. 31, He points to the Father in heaven as greater and above Himself. It is the status præsens of the Son compared with the Divine government of the Father—as Luthardt after Calvin maintains. This is so obvious that many fathers (Origen, Athanasius, Cyril, Epiphanius) cite the words, though they scarcely so read them, thus: ὁ πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με or ἀποστείλας με πατήρ—without rightly noting what this involved. Not so much "as opposed to the suffering and dying Son of man"—although this touches the kernel of the matter—but the Father is already greater when compared with the *Son*, as He is *now* the emptied and humiliated Son of man, and that means certainly, first of all, as Kling very properly says—Higher, more glorious, *mightier;* ch. x. 29, is decisive for this meaning. That a *beatior* is also included, as Bengel, Storr, and others assert, is true, but only as a *deduction* suited to the connection; for μέγας, μείζων in itself has no such meaning—although וַיִּגְדַּל, Gen. xxvi. 13, has been strangely quoted to prove it. The departure of the Son to the Father, into the full fellowship of His might and glory, is an exaltation; and at that they should rejoice. The Son so speaks, as Bengel expresses it—Ut filius Dei in carne *ad Patrem tendens*. But this was intended as it et captui illi, quem discipuli tum habebant, et temporis reique præsenti, quum de perfectione ad Patrem agebatur, erat accommodatissimum,—so that any deeper reference to the relations of essence between Father and Son are not to be sought for here.[2]

[1] "A mere man could least of all have said this concerning himself." Brandt.

[2] Liebner's speculations (Christologie i. 150 ff.) about an eternal κένωσις

Hosted by Google

We have recognised from the outset that the Lord would have His disciples rejoice pre-eminently *on His* own account, because He was going to the Greater, to become Himself once more great and high; we gladly admit, with Olshausen, "the exceeding delicacy of thought by which the Lord appeals to the love which they bear *Him* for *their own consolation*: ye love Me, then rejoice that I go to the Father, for it is good for *Myself*." But, nevertheless, in order not to be one-sided, we must admit what indeed preceded in καὶ ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, that the Lord does not speak as if He would exclude them—It is expedient *for you* that I go away, ch. xvi. 7. Both meanings lie, finally, in the word, that the Father is greater. The first obvious deduction is, I Myself shall be exalted—the next, And will send from the Father the Comforter, work mightily in you, and give effect to your prayers, yea, come again Myself in life and glory. Lampe also decides for gaudium discipulorum tum Christi, tum sui causâ. Here, again, not as Stolz says: "God can better protect you than My visible presence;" and, Lücke, alas, "The Father is a more mighty protection!" For this postponement of the Son, who goeth to the Father (as if He were to *continue* less!), is rationalistic, and opposes the substance generally of these farewell discourses. Assuredly the disciples were to expect, not from the greater Father according to this distinction, but actually from the Son gone to Him, and then alike great, consolation, salvation, and power, yea, all that He had promised to them; and that is very much more than mere *protection!*

of the Son even in the Trinity, have no exegetical point of connection with our present text, and belong to the μυστήριον ἐνδιάθετον of an "eternal God-man" which the Scripture nowhere directly affirms—and with which we would now have nothing to do. Just so, Olshausen sinks too deep, falling back almost upon the ἀγέννητος and γέννητος again, in the thought, inappropriate here, that the Father being the ground of the Son, therefore the return to the Father was the satisfaction of the *longing* of the Son, who yearned for His original. This might previously lie in the undertone of the πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, but it is wrong to say—"this is the relation of the Son to the Father which is indicated by the words μείζων μου ἐστί." Similarly, but more prudently, v. Gerlach: "as long as the Son of God by reason of His voluntary humiliation was *less* than the Father, He pressed upwards struggling and suffering to His *original*." Why not, rather, what he himself continues with—to His *glorification*, re-exaltation?

Hosted by Google

More correctly Luther: "I go to My glory for your sakes too, and enter My kingdom where I can protect and *help* you, against *all* that can hurt."[1]

Ver. 29. Just as in ch. xiii. 19. Hence we may, generally, supplement *ye might believe* by ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι—or understand the πιστεύειν εἰς αὐτόν required from them at the beginning. This must be taken as August. Tract. 79 remarks: non fide novâ, sed auctâ, aut certe, cum mortuus esset, defectâ, cum resurrexisset, refectâ. Yet in speaking after this manner the Lord scarcely admits their present faith to be faith, just as in the case of their love. *What* was it that He told them before it came to pass? This we have not to seek, with Lücke, in the previous promises, ver. 26 to wit; but it refers immediately to the *going to the Father* and the *coming again;* of course, however, including all that is bound up with these truths.

Ver. 30. He will no longer speak *much* to them, thus yet a little more—evidence of what was previously asserted that He well knew that He would not yet altogether cease and break off. The way to the Father leads, for the Son of man and for the redemption of mankind, through death, through the suffering of death; but in this Satan is the ruling proximate agent, with whom therefore He first has to do. Mark once more the perpetual variation of the highest opposites in the clear and tranquil consciousness of Jesus: from the glory of the Almighty Father in heaven He turns to the devil's power of darkness upon earth, among men. He perfectly well knows His way and His task. The *prince of the world*[2] comes in hostile attack upon Him,—by no means *merely* through men in whom he lives and works, as Tholuck says, "the spirit of darkness working in My enemies."[3] This is included, but is certainly not all; for Lu. xxii. 53 does not give us two parallel sayings, but *distinguishes* the still more strongly marked power of darkness (in which He had already struggled with death and the prince of death, ver. 44), from

[1] His Pentecost sermon in Niethammer.

[2] Τούτου is not genuine, but derived from the parallels, chs. xii. 31, xvi. 11.

[3] Many even refer it to Judas, who was just returning—See, there cometh Satan!! Schleiermacher is much too bold—All those who stand up against Me will fail to fasten a spot of guilt upon Me!

Hosted by Google

their hour. The *soul-sufferings* of Christ, as they were from without, came upon Him from the influence and assault of Satan: this is a truth which has always been certain in orthodox faith. Here He encounters the second greater temptation, now through fear and horror as the first time through pleasure and desire.[1] But the Lord is beforehand assured of His victory in the final, decisive conflict with the enemy; He knows that the mighty one must become impotent against Himself, *because he hath nothing* in Him. "Thus He comforts and encourages Himself against the injurious devil."—(Luther.)

Is ἐν ἐμοί to be taken as standing simply for εἰς ἐμέ? Is οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν to be explained merely of might? Thus scil. ποιεῖν, he can do nothing against Me, *hath nothing over Me?* For this, ἐν αὐτῷ, Matt. xvii. 12, and ἔχειν ποιῆσαι, Lu. xii. 4, are compared. We confidently think otherwise, for this mere assurance that the devil could do nothing further against Him is here in the mouth of our Lord too little; and the *in Me*, taken with the mere *hath*, is plainly enough to be understood in its most simple and obvious meaning. Lange: no point of seizure. We could not at once adopt Lampe's nihil neque *juris* neque *virium*. For this last—no *power*—is not plainly spoken, but left to be deduced, for the ἐν ἐμοί gives the reason for the εἰς ἐμέ which is not at first added. Let the sublime antithesis be observed, in which the Lord opposes *Himself* alone to the whole κόσμος. Wherefore is Satan, as having the power of death, the lord of all humanity? Wherefore but because of sin? Where he finds guilt he has a claim, consequently a power. Just *that* is the point of seizure. According to this correct and scriptural thought, which applies here if anywhere, the ancients supplemented the plain words ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν by the correct τὶ τῶν ἰδίων. Nonnus, concisely and well, μέρος. August. Tract. 79: nullum omnino scilicet peccatum; which coincides at bottom with Euthymius' αἴτιον θανάτου. The same was signified by the varr. readings and glosses, εὑρήσει, εὑρίσκει, and so forth. The καί between the two clauses is certainly adversative, and we might waver between this view,—*But* he has nothing, will find nothing in Me, which is of his own, and which could

[1] We may refer to our notes in Hebräerbrief i. 49. These renounced truths we cannot be ever anew investigating and establishing.

Hosted by Google

give him right and power over Me—and the other, He *cometh* upon Me, *although* He has no authority to do so. We prefer the latter, because that makes the following ἀλλά plain.

Ver. 31. The construction is here again dubious. Grotius, whom Paulus and Kuinoel follow, would understand the καί as propterea, making it introduce the minor in the argument; but this is too artificial and inappropriate to need any refutation. But should we not, however, with Bengel, set the period after ποιῶ? Then should we supplement it—*But he cometh*, nevertheless, on Me, the Father permitteth that, and I bear it, yea, it is the Father's will and I obey it—that thereby the world through the knowledge of My love and My obedience may be saved, or its salvation rendered possible. This is in any case the meaning of the *But*, which solves *the mystery of his coming who nevertheless hath nothing in Him;* inasmuch as no construction changes this sense—I give Myself up voluntarily and obedient for the good of the world. Meanwhile, the ellipsis after ἀλλά, much more *between* ἀλλά and ἵνα, is very harsh; and besides that the sudden *setting out* as a clause of itself is too abrupt. Therefore we hold with the ancients who make the ἐγείρεσθε depend on the preceding clause, and thus refer the ἀλλά itself to the breaking off summons. Nevertheless, not, with Lücke—*Be it so* then (for he has not rightly understood the previous ἐν ἐμοί)—but, giving it still the adversative meaning, *But he cometh* nevertheless, I suffer him to come against Me, I go Myself to meet him; and *instead of that* spoken in common (we shall soon see why)—Let *us* go to meet him!

The *world* is to know the love of the Son to the Father by His obedience; wherefore not rather the love of the Father and the Son to it, the world? This would be more obvious, but the striking application instead of it is strictly in harmony with the profound view which makes everything here rest upon the relation of the Father and the Son. Yea, the voluntary obedience of Christ, which in the bitter sufferings of death so strongly attested itself, not enforced but springing solely from *love*, is the first thing which the world is to know, before knowing all which springs from it. The love *to the Father* is the perfect consent of His will to His gracious counsel to redeem thereby the world; this is the ground and substance of the ἐνετείλατο. The ἐντολή

Hosted by Google

of the Father was before spoken of in ch. x. 18 and xii. 49. Always to the end does the Son repose in this supreme Ἀεί—it is ever "a *mystery:* the Father wills it! Wherefore? This he tells us not." (Joh. v. Müller.) Enough, that if the world knoweth the *self-surrender* of Christ in order to the accomplishment of this counsel, it may yet experience its fruit in its own salvation. Here also to this same world, whose prince Satan is, freedom and salvation are again offered with the same ἵνα as in ch. iii. 17. Bengel: that the world may cease to be the world, and savingly acknowledge the Father's good pleasure in Me.

It is, finally, equally striking with the former transition, that the Lord should include and take with Him the disciples in His *let us go* to sufferings and death. He who can reconcile himself to regard this as referring merely to their external accompanying to Gethsemane, may do so; but we find further something typical in the background. The Lord utters it for the future of *their following* in the same way of suffering and obedience, in the fellowship of His cross; and thus has the Spirit expounded this *conclusion* to the church, in many a Pentecost sermon. Such an application has its justifiable ground in the undertone of the Spirit's meaning. Hence it is not unexegetical when the Berlenb. Bibel comments: "Up! up! let us go forth to suffering and the fulfilment of the Divine will! Thus does the Lord arouse them, and carry them with Him into His contest, that they may be His followers in the way of suffering." We would add, once more, In order that (further in the future) the world may see also your love to Me in your obedience to My commands, and thereby be convinced that ye are in Me as I am in you, and recognise your commission to save by your self-sacrificing testimony all who will be saved.

RENEWED FAREWELL DISCOURSES DURING THE DELAY OF SETTING FORTH—CHS. XV. XVI. SIMILITUDE OF THE VINE AND THE BRANCHES—CH. XV. 1–6.

The text rigidly requires that we interpose here—*Then they arose*, but went *not yet* forth from the place, and the Lord proceeded to speak further. Every other distribution and account

Hosted by Google

of these discourses, as they are immediately linked one to another, disturbs, according to our simple and decided feeling, the irremoveable sense of the letter. St John does not "forget," in his especial attention to the discourses themselves, their scenery (as Lücke, with whom we agree in the main, rather unhappily expresses it); but the Lord's words are so entirely the great concernment that He deliberately hastens over everything external, teaching us what is the only worthy and profitable course for ourselves. Meanwhile, if we, not elevated to so lofty a point as he, require a "scenery" in the midst of which we may better hear our Lord's words, there are sufficient intimations here for its construction. We may suppose that the disciples obeyed the *Arise* as soon as it was spoken, and (as the *Let us go* renders highly probable) that the Lord Himself arose; had they, however, actually gone forth, the Evangelist would certainly have said so in a simple word. Thus, not to mention the harmonising which would interpose here the going into the town, the passover and the supper, we cannot admit even the old and customary supposition that all which now follows was uttered after the setting forth, and *in the way*.[1] For in ch. xviii. 1 we have the ἐξῆλθε express, which as related to ch. xiv. 31, cannot possibly intimate the departure only "outside the town-boundaries" (as Lange maintains against myself,—what significance would these limits have here?); besides which, we cannot imagine how the Lord could have uttered these most confidential final sayings in the open air, amid the crowds which we must assume at the feast time—the last prayer especially requiring a secluded and undisturbed place. The Lord begins anew to speak, while still in the room of the paschal meal, on the point of departure, and surrounded by His disciples. His words are still more penetrating and affecting: first, concerning the permanent bond of love between Him and them, then, in more specific reference to

[1] Instead of which Chrysos. (see in Klee) supposed that the Lord led away His disciples, troubled about the *place* where they had been, to another place; that so regarding themselves more safe they might better hear the remainder! Very much might be urged in objection to this. It requires a poetical expounder like Lange to devise a going forth under the starry heavens at ch. xiv. 2—(after an "exit from the room" between chs. xiii. and xiv., of which there is no hint)—and then for ch. xv. to discover not only vines around but burning fires also in the garden.

Hosted by Google

His farewell, concerning all that would follow after and result from His departure.[1] See our distribution of the whole at the outset. Well, then, My way is unto death and separation from you—but we are and we shall remain united for ever. *As ye surround Me now*, in faith and in love hanging already on Me, so shall it be and much more, our unity shall be truly internal—I the Vine, ye the branches. What a majestic *Ἐγώ* once more at this head of the new discourse!

And now as to the *occasion* for this selected similitude? We must at once set aside Tholuck, who maintains without any ground that Christ *everywhere* derived the similitudes which He employed from *something which met His eyes;* and Hezel, who says that He *always* took occasion from the matters of common life which were before Him at the time. It is not difficult to contradict this "everywhere" and "always" by sure examples; and, furthermore, it seems to us petty and unworthy to suppose that the Lord would restrict Himself always to things sensibly present, while He had before His eyes and at His command the whole treasure of the types and symbols of the kingdom of heaven which had been impressed upon all nature at the creation, and which had been already abundantly illustrated in the ancient Scriptures. Nor was the weakness or the dulness of the disciples so great as to render this necessary on their account. There was no need that vines should be clustering round the window, or that vineyards should have been passed through on the road, or that the room should be decorated with vine foliage (all which have been assumed), to account for the Lord's choice of the figure. It is perfectly out of keeping to introduce the artificial vine on the door of the temple (Joseph. Bell. Jud. 5, 5, 4, Arch. 15, 11, 3), which Lampe refers to with *forte quoque*, and Rosenmüller insisted on. Although this vine, intended (as Olshausen remarks) to be a type of Israel, might seem to be an anticipatory prophecy of that which our Lord's words here teach, yet *now* and *in this place* a designed allusion to such shadows in the forsaken temple is quite inappropriate. When the Lord now

[1] Thus correctly, *e.g.*, the Hirschb. Bibel, v. Gerlach, Pfenninger, Knapp, Tholuck, Olshausen, Lücke, Klee. The Berlenb. Bibel: "Here Christ paused a while and contemplated His disciples, to see how they breathed after His words. Then follow other discourses."

Hosted by Google

begins to speak of a *vine*, His language is in harmony with the whole system of the sacred language of figures (for as to this the "everywhere" and "always" holds good in every figure)—but its connection with that system has at least a twofold, probably a threefold, foundation. The two certain and related grounds are *nature* in itself, and the *prophetic phraseology* which interprets nature; the third is introduced by the recently instituted *supper*. The vine is one of the most significant emblems in nature, immediately illustrating that interpretation of its mystery, which here reaches its culmination: its stock and stem unsightly, but vigorous, beautiful, richly spreading in its foliage, and moreover bearing the noblest, the most generous of all fruits (Judg. ix. 13; Ps. civ. 15)—the top and crown of herbs of the field, the grape the end of the year as the violet its beginning—requiring much toil and care, its wood useless independently of the fruit—and whatever else may be observed in this hieroglyphic of nature. *Therefore* also in the Old Testament the vine spreading widely from its root and stem, vigorously putting forth its new branches, is a type of fruitful growth generally (Ezek. xvii. 6, xix. 10)—and then specially a figure of Israel,—and finally and prophetically, even of the Messiah and His people, as shadowed in then existing Israel. We know how the Lord Jesus unfolded His vineyard-parable taken from Jer. v. in Matt. xxi. But we must also remember the individual vine by the fig-tree, Joel i. 7 (Hos. ix. 10), Jer. ii. 21.[1] Finally, Israel is in Ps. lxxx. 15–18, a type of the Son of man, whom the Lord as His Son planted and made strong for Himself, thus of the Messiah and of all who belong to Him. All this was fore-prepared in the prophetical phraseology, intimating a new planting after the destruction of the old; so that Luthardt may rightly say, "Since God was constrained to give His vineyard up to ruin, He separated for Himself this vine, and designed it to be a new beginning from which a great increase should take its rise."[2] Moreover, vines

[1] Where, however, the ἀληθινός of the Sept. has quite another sense than here in St John, and has been very confusedly brought into comparison.

[2] This is more scriptural, and more in harmony with the Old Testament view than that of Schleiermacher: "Human nature, before the Redeemer's manifestation, was the wild vine; and if He had not come, the noble and beautiful fruit which human nature was to bear in the garden of the Lord would never have been produced."

Hosted by Google

were so familiar a sight to the Israelites generally, even round about Jerusalem and upon the sides of their houses (Ps. cxxviii. 3), that our Lord needed no specific object to point His allusion here. Putting all this together, then, how natural was this similitude, especially just after the institution of the supper had given the highest consecration to the symbol of the vine! This last point of connection is made prominent by Grotius, and after him Nösselt, Knapp, etc.; and we do not deny the full force of the idea; but we must contend against the *exclusive* reference to the sacrament as too individualised, and maintain that the Lord was constrained, as it were, to "make choice" of the wine in the institution—to use their unhappy word—on account of the entire symbolism of Scripture and nature, which should here find its great solution. We may indeed say with Ebrard that the vine-similitude which now follows declares the "true meaning of the sacrament"—and reassert, what has been more than once intimated, that St John's Gospel gives us this discourse concerning the inmost essence of the sacrament instead of the historical narration of its institution.[1] Bread and wine are co-related (even in nature, Ps. civ. 14, 15), as the flesh and blood in man's personality; hence Christ is the bread of life, the *corn of wheat* in the general, inasmuch as from His *body* and life the church is nourished, yea derives its original existence, but as He gives His life to death for that purpose, and in His blood makes us especially partakers thereof, He is also the *vine*. The juice of the grape, the juice of stem and branches generally which is to be glorified, as it were, into a spirituous energy, is, according to the profound phraseology of Scripture—which has its classical analogies in the *αἷμα βοτρύων* of Ach. Tatius, the sanguis terræ of Pliny, the uvarum frigidus sanguis of Cassiodorus—the *blood* and *life* of the noble plant; and hence the expressions of Gen. xlix. 11; Deut. xxxii. 14; 1 Macc. vi. 34; Isa. lxiii. 2, comp. Rev. xix. 13, 15, etc. This was one blood, one sap, one life to circulate in the true branches of the true vine:—and here we have a broad and deep foundation in nature and Scripture for

[1] But this must not be taken as Herder strangely put it: "The Evangelist *might not* introduce the misused symbol of the sacrament which had been (by perversion at first?!) incorporated into Christianity; but instead of that he unfolded most expressly its true *significance*."

Hosted by Google

the so-called "similitude," while the sacrament was its point of immediate connection. Pfenninger's poetical notion, however, is too far-fetched, that the disciples might have asked, on account of Lu. xxii. 18, "Lord, when shall we drink again with Thee the fruit of the vine?" and that now the answer came,—For the present and till then I am Myself the Vine, from which ye are to derive as branches the sap of your nourishment and life!

The discourse of the vine and the branches is full of gracious promise, but it is also hortatory, and even warning in its tone (vers. 1–4); it gives such strong encouragement and so convincingly humbles at the same time, that it may be employed as a Gospel for Advent, as well as for the text of specifically evangelical sermons of penitence and confession. "What the Apostles afterwards taught with regard to our *justification* as well as our *sanctification* being derived from our *being in Christ*—are all truths taken from these discourses of our Lord." (Rieger.) The more exact disposition of the whole, especially down to ver. 17, where a new element is introduced, we have already given.[1] Vers. 1–6 embrace the preparatory similitude in itself, though developed already into its signification. The proper subject of the figure precedes in vers. 1, 2; there is then interposed an unfigurative clause, ver. 3 (reminding of the feet-washing), in order to lead the way to an intenser repetition, going beyond the figure in *καθώς* and *ποιεῖν οὐδέν*—I am the Vine, ye are the branches! Then comes the unfigurative discourse:—the *abiding in Him*, that is, in His *love*, vers. 7–10; and once more, as standing in the midst of all, the word concerning *joy*, ver. 11; and then on the ground of this the most precise development of that *friendship* with Him who laid down His life for them, to which they are chosen and appointed, vers. 12–17.

Ver. 1. This is the normal passage for the illustration of the so-called Johannaean meaning of the word *ἀληθινός*. As in St John *ἀλήθεια* very frequently indicates not merely what we call in current language truth, but essential reality—whether

[1] B.-Crusius disposes otherwise this entire chapter, after the logical arrangement of bad sermons: How the disciples are to walk after His departure—as it regards Him, vers. 1–11; one another, vers. 12–17; the world, ver. 17 to the end.

Hosted by Google

of things answering to their types, fulfilment consummating prophecy, accomplishment completing preparation—so likewise is *ἀληθινόν* the true and genuine, that which is real and proper in the full truth of its word and idea. Hence the true light, ch. i. 9—the genuine worshippers, ch. iv. 23—the true bread from heaven, ch. vi. 32. In full protest against the inadequate view which would make the material production of the earth which bears this name the "real" vine, our Lord testifies, and His meaning alone gave the Evangelist his Greek word, that He Himself is *the real, the essential* Vine. This is not in opposition to a false, spurious, degenerate growth, as in Jer. ii. 21, זֶרַע אֱמֶת[1] —nor (as Braune thinks) to the artificial imitation of a vine on the gate of the temple. But it would say, The vine in nature is only a figure and symbol pointing to and prophesying of Me; just so Israel as God's vine in the prophets is only an imperfect type; but the full reality of all that these figures of nature and Scripture indicate is found in Me as the second Adam, as the root and stem from which My people derive their growth and life, and produce their fruit. Yes, verily, in virtue of His *human* nature, as Augustin rightly remarked, Christ is to the world such a vine, the root and stem of a new fruit-bearing life:[2] and therefore He goes on to speak of the *Father* who sent and implanted Him in humanity. This is the truth, and not what Lange says of the "eternal Vine in the midst of the world and humanity—whose shoots *men* are in their relation to Him—whose roots in the life of the *Logos* pervade the ground and soil of the whole world." As it respects the individual expressions here used, it has been usually remarked that *γεωργός* is used in classical writers specifically for *ἀμπελουργός*, and husbandman for vine-dresser; and this cannot be denied. (Hence we have even *γεωργεῖν* with such a limitation in Plato, with *τὴν ἄμπελον* in Achill. Tat., and often in the writers on husbandry with *οἶνον*.) Further, that *γεωργός*, as distinguished from *γεωπόνος*, does not so much indicate the labouring servant as the owner of the land, the lord who manages his own property.[3]

[1] Which Ebrard adduces, and also without authority places in the original of Isa. xxvii. 2.

[2] Nonnus well says, *ἐγὼ παλιναυξέϊ κόσμῳ ζωῆς ἄμπελός εἰμι.*

[3] Lampe referred to Philo's Comment. on Gen. ix. 20.

Hosted by Google

In all this thus much is true, that the γεωργία or cultivation of the land in general *includes* also the tillage of vines as a very important part of it, so that we accordingly speak of *cultivating* the vine, or *growing* wine; as also that the γεωργός *may be* at the same time (whether labouring himself or not labouring) the actual owner.[1] Thus here, though we would translate almost unhesitatingly with Luther "vine-dresser," it appears to us that the use of the *more general* expression (where the more specific was close at hand) points to a more general acceptation, as appears in the θεοῦ γεώργιον of 1 Cor. iii. 9; similarly, though in Lu. xiii. 7 the *subordinate labourer* is called ἀμπελουργός, we would not say that *here* God is designedly *distinguished* from such. The Father is, rather, in the highest and most proper sense the *Planter* and *Cultivator*, as the Lord of all that grows in the world, and especially in the kingdom of God; consequently in an especial manner of that very *Vine* of which the words here speak. He planted His Son as the Son of man to be the Vine which should put forth its branches, already in His birth in our flesh; but now in His death, which is itself no other than the full birth, the fructifying, the glorification of the Son of man, *He plants Him more deeply and effectually*, and makes Him that which He here says—Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή. Luther's exposition, therefore, is entirely right in apprehending the meaning to be that Christ is made of the Father through the sufferings of death a vine putting forth its branches. "This is a most gracious figure. It is a tender prosopopeia in which He places before our eyes not a useless unfruitful tree, but the beautiful vine, which is indeed not precious to look upon, but bears much fruit, and yields the most gracious and sweetest juice. And He explains that all the sufferings which both He and they should encounter are no other than the diligent care and watchfulness which a vine-dresser bestows upon his vine and its branches, *that it may thrive and bear plentifully*." It is, indeed, as if the Lord had gone on to say: Let My heavenly Father now (when the prince of this world cometh, but only as an instrument in the hands of His government) do with Me what He will, it will all turn to the

[1] See, *e.g.*, in New Testament the γεωργούς, Matt. xxi. 33, and the κοπιῶντα, 2 Tim. ii. 6.

Hosted by Google

bringing forth much fruit (ch. xii. 24). Do ye not suppose that this supreme and true γεωργός understands well how the land or the vineyard is to be cultivated? It is *fruit* which He looks for; and to that end He doeth diligently and wisely all that in Him is; first upon Me whom He has planted as a vine, or rather whom He now first is truly planting, and then also upon you and all My branches. This is the connection, and transition to the following verse.

Ver. 2. In the related parable the discourse is of an entire vineyard, but now (on the ground of those before-cited passages of the Old Testament) it is plainly brought out that the whole planting consists in one stock, from which all other growth proceeds as only a branch, and one which must abide in Him. But who is a *branch* in Christ? Exposition too often, and preaching very generally, takes a restricted view of this, limiting it to those who have been converted to Christ in conscious faith, and born again through the full impartation of the Spirit. This is manifestly wrong; for the Lord also speaks, and at the very first, of altogether unfruitful branches; we have no liberty to lower the interpretation of this μὴ φέρον καρπόν, which is made still stronger by the contrast with the opposite. And yet it is a *branch in Him*—there is in this something at once startling and peculiar. It may be said, indeed, that those branches are here intended which bear fruit at first, that is, give early promise of it, but by not abiding in Him—*bring no fruit to perfection.* (Lu. viii. 14.) And this is right, as appears afterwards in vers. 4–6; but these are only included, and the absolute clause, beginning the sentence, leaves something more general behind. For this is the point of the punishmemt afterwards threatened, that a branch giving good promise at first shall and must be treated similarly with one which had been unfruitful from the beginning. But the Berlenb. Bible is far too general (falling into a great oversight for once) when it says: "Christ is a Head to all men, and thus in this sense all men hang upon Him; all races upon earth have a portion in this vine, and are called to the knowledge of it. The right to it is for all." For then the αἴρειν must at once be referred onwards to the last judgment; whereas, being parallel with καθαίρειν, it belongs first of all undoubtedly to the present care and labour put forth upon the

Hosted by Google

great Vine. In the end we shall find those alone exhibited who are in some way called, and who manifestly or secretly are transposed into the second Adam in the bond of grace, thus being fitted, and under obligation, to bring forth fruit; but if we would now apply what the Lord plainly speaks for a present application, then His entirely unfruitful branches are—not so much those who have all Divine might in the *knowledge* of Him who called them, albeit they again become barren and unfruitful (2 Pet. i. 3–8, where there was a first *φέρειν καρπόν*); but, as our Lord plainly discloses to us in this seemingly strange saying, they exhibit to us the preparatory election and incorporation of many into a church which embraces souls from their birth, through the grace of baptism, and all the ecclesiastical communion which hangs upon it. Thus they are "Christians" especially, who have the word and sacraments, but receive them in vain; and to *these* the preacher should earnestly apply this saying! They are indeed planted in God's vineyard like that fig-tree, Lu. xiii. 6—even grafted for a beginning into the Vine.[1] Lampe, who might have learned here to correct his Reformed dogmatics, cannot but see at least that the *ἐν ἐμοί* is not to be severed from *κλῆμα* and attached to *φέρον καρπόν* (it is evidently assumed otherwise in the *following καὶ πᾶν*)—as, after the example of the Pesh., many have done. He falls afterward into embarrassment: etiam spurios palmites *quadantenus* concipi posse, *quasi* in Jesu sint, *supponitur;* and again, *in debiliori sensu* it may be said of those who are found merely in the external church. But here there is no *quasi;* the same real *ἐν ἐμοί* is a foundation for the whole. As, according to Acts xvii. 26, all nations of men have sprung from the one blood of the first Adam, so there is now a fellowship with the second Adam which is mediated by the calling word and the prevenient sacramental blessing, and which embraces in succession the nations as a whole, implanting the germ of regeneration and of growth together in a body. These are called and they are collectively branches already in Christ, although more is then required in order to their becoming (in the *stricter* similitude of

[1] For although the figure goes not expressly so far back, yet in its deepest principle Loskiel is quite right in saying—"Here only ingrafted branches can be spoken of."

Hosted by Google

the Apostle, which, as must be seen, is by no means simply parallel with this) living *members* of His true body. See, moreover, Rom. vi. 3–6, which truly holds good for the baptism of children, although in such a sense that in the case of the greater part a growing together is supposed subsequently to follow. Where it is not so, the *taking away* of the unfruitful is assuredly for the most part (though not altogether) only a manifestation of the separation from Christ which had already taken place. More will be seen upon ver. 6. The figure preserves its truth just in this its centre, the connection between the stem and the branches; although the ἐν, other than which no expression could have been employed, passes onward after a manner from the mere "on" into the more proper "in"—an interchange which Luther's translation has well preserved by the corresponding "*an*" and "*in*."

Secondly, what is the *fruit* on which all depends? We must not superficially speak immediately of good *works*, instead of seizing more internally the fruits of the Spirit, according to Gal. v. 22; nor must we too exclusively emphasize the results of external activity, by which one branch produces others. All this is indeed included, inasmuch as the Spirit's life in Christ will assuredly exhibit itself in outward works, and every living Christian does mediately or immediately, consciously or unconsciously, work to the winning of others; but the *fruit* which the Vine-dresser desires is in its general principle only the consummation and ripening of our own regeneration, as the cluster so to speak is the glorified form and complete manifestation of the virtue of the branch.

Finally, the *purging*, by which the fruit is increased, according to the capacity and obligation of the branch as deriving its vigour from the vine,—is a most important and prominent feature of the similitude, the most essential point in the diligent and wise *culture* which the vine itself needs! Everything here goes strangely against appearances. As it regards the vine-stock itself, before it puts forth its shoots, an inexperienced person might ask, For what purpose is this crooked and unsightly tree in this beautiful garden? And then the unpitying cutting away of so many shoots, seemingly so green and healthy. This has reference in part to entire branches which are worth-

Hosted by Google

less, and in part to the very best branches themselves, from which must be lopped off everything which would grow wildly into wood and leaf, to the injury of the vital energy required for the fruit. This connection is even expressed by the paronomasia between *αἴρει* and *καθαίρει* (well imitated by Lange's *abschneiden* and *beschneiden*), which is against the etymology, and of course belongs simply to St John's reproduction of the words, but must be recognised in itself. That *καθαίρειν* had been the actual term for the pruning of vines cannot be proved, but it was an obvious expression which might sometimes be used for that purpose. Thus there may be found in it a certain allusion to the state of circumcision; but the fundamental signification of the word must hold its right. The Lord did not use any such direct expression as זמר; for ver. 3 connects the *καθαροί* of His interpretation with this *καθαίρειν*, which already is a transition to unfigurative language. The noble Vine itself and in itself needed no pruning and purging, nor is the taking away of the unfruitful branches so regarded; but the fruitful branches undergo this taking away, that they may not themselves be cut off, but rather become continually more fruitful.[1] The pruning-knife of the heavenly Vine-dresser is applied to us indeed in that external tribulation and discipline which none of us can escape; nevertheless the work is done only by internal discipline, and there is, as we shall hear presently, a purification which is effected through the *word*. But before we pass on to that, we must note the expressly twofold *πᾶν*, which intimates that it is applied without respect of persons, sparing none and pretermitting none, rigid and faithful according to the vine-dressing rule which aims at fruit and the utmost possible fruit:—thus does God cultivate His vine, and rigidly prune all its branches. Without respect of persons—we may well say, for in this *παροιμία* concerning living branches, which are free to abide in the vine or not, which must be *cleansed*, and to whom the *word* is spoken, the figure and its interpretation pass one into the other from the beginning. Hence in ver. 3 a simple *unfigurative* word is interposed, in order to lay the foundation for the *mixed* figure and interpretation in vers. 4–6.

[1] Bengel: Quodsi auferri a te quæ mala sunt nolis, auferre te ipsum oportebit.

Hosted by Google

Ver. 3. Even the Apostles, whom now the direct address takes out from among the many branches contemplated in ver. 2, *were* by nature *not* clean or not capable of that fruit which the Father now expects from His vine; but their connection with Christ established through their first faith has made them branches: and that is their first fundamental purity. The Lord undeniably recalls to their remembrance the words of ch. xiii. 10; but the word on account of or through which[1] they had become clean, is not generally "any single word of the Lord in which there could have been salvation." (Schleierm.) —Therefore not that assurance given at the feet-washing—but the whole of the words of His discourse with them, which they had received in faith. The λελάληκα which so often in these discourses presupposes a close and departure, does not hinder us from including all the other words which nevertheless followed down to ch. xvi. 27, 33. Olshausen says rightly that ὁ λόγος is here quite the same as τὰ ῥήματα, ver. 7—with which also ch. xvii. 6, 8 may be compared. Since ἤδη καθαροί apparently contradicts the previous καθαίρειν, as if this latter were now unnecessary, it drives us to a deeper understanding of these relative expressions, with their only hinted meanings; but the Spirit brings us to this understanding in living knowledge and experience. The καθαροί ἐστε retains, according to ch. xiii. 10, its full truth: thus it is neither, Ye *might*, and ought to have been already clean—nor is the ἤδη to be referred to the time of the Holy Ghost as brought forward into the present, for the word already spoken opposes this latter. But still less is this first καθαρός to be taken in the full meaning of the predicted καθαίρειν, as Stolz strangely interpreted—already *circumcised* and pure! But there is here indicated the important difference between the first, mighty *speaking clean* of justification which unites with Christ, and the continuous sanctification unto holiness. By this first election of grace (compare afterwards ver. 16), the wild plant is ingrafted into Christ and made into a branch; without this fruit could not be spoken of, much less the increase of fruit through purging. Those who are spoken clean at the beginning are clean; yet there follows on

[1] See on this transition of the ideas in διά, in Jno. vi. 56, 57.

Hosted by Google

that very account the deepening appropriation of this grace, which in continual mutual influence results from holiness unto holiness. Hiller: "That which is clean bears fruit; that which bears fruit becomes also clean." But this latter, the striving after holiness (*ἁγνίζει ἑαυτόν*, 1 Jno. iii. 3), which is awakened in the joy and new power of personal redemption, goes not forward, on account of our weakness and still-remaining impurity, without the help of the pruning-knife of discipline, which takes away every wild out-growth. Again, all the cultivation and care of disciplining grace is efficient only on the condition of our own receiving and faithfully keeping His word, our *abiding* on and in Christ. If the purging was before especially attributed to the Father, we now see that *Christ*, the living Vine, at once begins by His word to cleanse, and thus is *Himself the Vine-dresser;* for where the figure fails the plain words must complete the sense; thus exhibiting everywhere the essential unity of the Father and the Son. Chrys. and Augustine made use of this against the Arians, and we may add the *I have chosen and appointed*, ver. 16. All is originally from the Father, who plants and watches over His Son as a vine; but all is in equally essential truth from the same Son, who elects and makes fruitful His branches through His own word and Spirit.

Vers. 4, 5. This is indeed a wonderful Vine, which desires the *abiding* in Him; and they are wonderful branches which abide firm and grow ever more firmly together, even while they yet may separate themselves, else were they not living branches. Here the "on Me" has become "in Me," inasmuch as (for *thus far* the similitude reaches) the connection of the shoots with the stem is no mere joining on, but there is a participation of the same juice flowing from one into the other. With the *κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν* there follows no second Imperative (as is self-evident), nor is it a mere promise, Then will I also abide in you! But they are connected conditionally, So act by your abiding *that* I, as I gladly would, may abide in you! The *κἀγώ* has indeed been taken for *καθὼς ἐγώ*, with a comparison of vers. 9, 10, ch. xvii. 21, 22—but that is something different, and, after the Lord has first given Himself to them, He now makes His abiding in them actually dependent on their abiding in Him. This, although contradicting a certain theology, is not

Hosted by Google

to be denied here, any more than in Scripture generally; we shall hear presently that those who abide not are to be thrown away! Ebrard develops the sacramental doctrine well from this sentence, and says, The two confessions appear to divide this verse, inasmuch as the one emphasizes the μείνατε on our side, and the other the κἀγώ on the Lord's. Assuredly, without our abiding in Him there is no abiding of the Lord in us; as without our receiving Him there is no such coming as ends in His indwelling. Yet it is not on the other hand to be forgotten, that He ever comes first and offers Himself, as we can abide in Him only while we—eat and drink. The truth which is here twice emphatically made prominent as the *interpretation* of the figure, that no one can do anything of himself, without and apart from Him, coincides in meaning with that utterance of ch. vi. 53, 56; and Roos thinks it "remarkable" that Christ does not repeat the saying about mutual *abiding* until He had instituted the ordinance for the eating and drinking His flesh and blood.

With great emphasis of only seeming tautology, He repeats the concentrated theme of the whole discourse here uttered:—I am the Vine, ye are the branches! By no means otherwise! Ye are nothing more than branches, and only such in Me! And thus, Whosoever abideth in Me (so that I can abide in him), *he* and no other—but certainly every such, not merely ye Apostles! *Much* fruit brings, finally, every living, abiding branch; for the overflowing sap of the vine pervades with so much vigour everything which is in Him. The following ὅτι significantly connects itself with the μένων, made prominent by the οὗτος. We might expect, *But* without Me *nothing!* That, however, would be something different, and a flat repetition of what has been already presupposed; therefore now the *for* refers the warning also to the already implanted and dependent branches:—even *ye* can do nothing if, and so far as, ye do not *abide!* How many there are who think they can do much without the Lord—but "the question here is not of external doing, and general influence upon men, but of the holy power to save ourselves and others, through deliverance from sin and death." (Schmieder.) Leaves and sour grapes are not fruit; there are grapes of the vine of Sodom, grapes of gall and clusters of bit-

Hosted by Google

terness. (Deut. xxxii. 32, 33.) Whosoever can do anything which avails before God, with a right mind, and action, and influence, can do it only through fellowship with Christ; for even the "sonship to God which leads to Christ" is only mediated by the already latent preparatory grace of Christ.[1] The grace which comes to us universally through Christ is absolutely necessary to account for even the "little righteousness of the merciful Samaritan," for which, however, Hollenbusch, in well-meaning error, holds "our natural virtue sufficient." But how much more absolutely true is it that for the full fruit-bearing of actual disciples, the same Christ alone affords the power! and yet how slow we are in fundamentally learning what is here declared and testified. "This word must evermore pursue us, so lightly do we forget it." (Berl. Bibel.) Χωρὶς ἐμοῦ is no mere *without*, which would say too little, and might be understood of the co-operation of our power and fidelity with His, of the mere *assistance* of grace; but it is "*apart from Me*," and corresponds with the ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ of the previous κλῆμα. Once more, this rigorous word of our Lord refers not simply to those who have entirely fallen away, as if He should say χωρισθέντες ἀπ' ἐμοῦ;[2] but in every instance in which those who hang upon Him allow themselves to be found "χωρὶς ἐμοῦ," their abiding thus being imperfect or partially ceasing, all their power and doing is so far reduced to a *nothing*. Finally, the ποιεῖν here, where figure and interpretation constantly interchange, is by no means the continuation of the figure, in which φέρειν and not ποιεῖν καρπόν is the word; but this *doing* goes beyond the figure, "falls into plain words" (de Wette), defends it at least from a too narrow interpretation, embraces together every *thinking anything as of ourselves* (2 Cor. iii. 5), with every result externally: apart from fellowship with Me ye can simply *accomplish* nothing, bring nothing to effect—that is, nothing good.

Ver. 6. At the close of the still figurative discourse it returns to the *taking away* of the unfruitful, ver. 2; but, as already said, in that verse those were especially referred to who have

[1] This, with reference to Lücke's unfounded remark against Calvin.

[2] This interpretation is jesuitically perverted by Maldonatus: Nos recte colligimus, Nisi in Christo manserimus, nihil possumus facere: *ergo* si in illo manserimus, *aliquid facere poterimus!*

Hosted by Google

been unfruitful from the beginning, while here the same doom is decreed against those who abide for a while, have brought forth a little fruit, but then, instead of being purged and suffering themselves to be *stript of self* in order to the increase of their fruit, are at last condemned as not abiding. As in the symbolical conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. vii. 19,[1] so here, at the actual conclusion of all our Lord's preaching, the word of John the Baptist falls also upon the disciples themselves!—The plain, express language of our Lord remains in incontrovertible opposition to all predestinarian, unscriptural error concerning the indefectibility of a state of grace, and the impossibility that those who have been born again should ever perish—If a man *abide not in Me.* Let any one who has Lampe at hand mark how he struggles here. Alas, we have, in the Lutheran Richter's family Bible, the strange statement, "There is no example in Holy Scripture of any who actually *bare fruit* having perished." This most perilous assertion, which sets out with a much too limited notion of fruit-bearing, and may in many ways be refuted, needs not to be rebutted by any difficult disquisition upon the scriptural examples of final apostasy, even of the saints; the warning to the saints which pervades the *entire* Epistle to the Hebrews is enough, with such individual passages, of which there are many, as 2 John 8. If, according to Rev. iii. 11, even the crown may be taken away from those who hold not fast what they have, how can we so confidently assure ourselves against losing the little fruit of our state of grace?

Let us rather mark, with docile minds, how profoundly the Lord indicates one after the other "*the stages of apostasy and rejection.*"[2] First comes the solitary individual ground of it—If a man *abideth not* in Me; in connection with which there may be for a while the semblance or the delusion that he is a branch, for he is still in the Vine, in the vineyard. Then the *five* stages of judgment, the accomplishment of which begins in time, is fulfilled in eternity:—casting forth, withering, gathering, casting into the fire, burning. Between the first two there

[1] See Vol. i.

[2] With which title an excellent essay of Zeller is to be found in the Beugg. Monatsblatt. 1836. Nr. 11.

Hosted by Google

may *probably* be room for conversion and holiness, although we must not make our appeal to the re-ingrafting of the branches cut off through unbelief in the Epistle to the Romans; but when it comes to the bundles they seem to belong irrecoverably to the fire.

The Aorist in the first two stages must be carefully explained. Ἐβλήθη has been interpreted—Thus is he properly already cast away! Lutherans have so expounded it, without observing the liability of such a view to predestinarian perversion, without noting how little the corroborating ἔξω fits that sense, and still less the whole of the subsequent progression. Is indeed every man not abiding *eo ipso* already *withered;* does not this rather point plainly to a gradual process of spiritual death and destruction, into which he surrenders himself? In perfect contrast the Vulgate took these Aorists for Futures, and Glassius agrees with it; but this as little harmonises with an exact criticism. Grotius approached nearer the truth—the Aorist indicates *quod fieri solet.* But we must not omit to find in it the decisive assurance that such is the case, after the presupposed μὴ μείνῃ, as Bengel says: eo ipso dignus est, qui ejiciatur, atque ejicietur certo—in apodosi τὸ ἐβλήθη denotat id, *quod protinus evenit,* cf. Matt. xviii. 15. Just as Winer: "every not abiding has that for its instant result"—to which Lücke assents, and B.-Crusius, "All is as good as done, it assuredly so comes to pass." We also regard this as the only true interpretation, and the more confidently as with καὶ συνάγουσιν the discourse proceeds in perfect correspondence with it. We further hold with Bengel that ἔξω can only be e vineâ, so that thus the *breaking off* and *cutting away* from the vine-stock does not come first as a judgment, since it is the branch which has separated itself and *fallen away.*[1] Nevertheless, as Zeller rightly expounds, with this very first ἔξω the sundering from connection with the kingdom of God, from its holy influence and blessing, is consummated. The supply ceases, and it seems actually even here already as if (at least according to the similitude) no further

[1] Thus not with Winer: "he is like a branch *broken* off and thrown away, he belongs from that moment no more to the fruit-bearing vine." Nor altogether with Grotius: ἐκβάλλεσθαι ἔξω in comparatione est præcidi a vite.

Hosted by Google

growth upon the vine or taking root was to be thought of; for only that which is still in God's vineyard, albeit torn off and lying on the ground, could be partakers of that saving energy of the Spirit which in its wonderful efficiency transcends nature, or become, as it were, connected with one of the many roots of the great Vine which pervades the entire vineyard. Suffice it that the first stage of *rejection* is as decisive and complete as the *not abiding* was.

The second follows necessarily and naturally. If the sundered and rejected branch still retained a little sap and life from its former connection (a feature which altogether corresponds with the actuality of spiritual life)—even that must be soon lost, it perfectly *withers*. This certainly does not take place first in the day of judgment, as Grotius thinks—"its *uselessness becomes apparent.*" This withering exhibits itself in its frightful reality before our eyes in the apostates, in whose case the delusion of independent power and virtue, and in the most fearful cases the imagination of a particular Christianity of their own, increases in the same degree as the last *life* from Jesus dies out. These are dry rejected branches, already given up by the heavenly Vine-dresser—and so must the earthly admit, after vain essays to re-establish their connection with the Vine. And if they are perfectly withered—*then*, but not before, because even judgment patiently leaves to all their time, they are *gathered together*. The sudden transition to the plural *αὐτά* would say—Think not that such a fearful case is a strange exception, it will befall many in time to come! Did the disciples now think of Judas? We think not; after chap. xiii. 29 follows their being undeceived as to the son of perdition in chap. xvii. 12,—and probably this last word itself was not understood by them all. But the Lord had assuredly the unhappy man before His eyes in this description, at least as long as He speaks in the singular number;[1] but now He looks through this prototype of apostates[2] to all that should follow

[1] Lampe would even explain the Aorist by reference to Judas—but this is too far-fetched.

[2] Judas was in any case once in Christ in a real sense, even if differently from others afterward, and almost passively so; otherwise he could not have been one lost among those given to Him, and not yet ripe for judgment.

Hosted by Google

down to the most distant futurity. Those who understand *συνάγειν* of mere gathering out, contradict the figurative description, the numbers which are suddenly introduced, and the very word itself. The parallel lies near—*συλλέγεται τὰ ζιζάνια*, Matt. xiii. 40; and according to this we should have here an abrupt transition to the judgment at the end of the world. Yet only a *transition;* for it gives us also an intimation how this collecting together of those destined to the fire is also *fore-prepared* in the judgments which befall the world and the outward kingdom:—to which, if we closely examine it, Matt. xiii. 30 by *ἐν καιρῷ* and *πρῶτον* points. Look, moreover, at the wicked unions and confederacies in the bonds of hell, into which, instead of fellowship with Christ and His saints, the withered branches fall, as the already prepared bundles of like sin and like doom! And they exist where our eyes do not see them, for there is everywhere a spiritual fellowship of the same natures. In *συνάγουσιν* and *βάλλουσι* we have not simply the active for the passive—they are collected and cast out; nor a meaningless—*they* collect them; but, as Matt. xiii. teaches us, it is an intimation of the work of the angels in the judgment. But the *fire* is assuredly, even on account of this most remarkable parallel, in which a synoptical *παραβολή* and a Johannæan *παροιμία* so closely touch one another, the oven of fire at the end of the days—with which the Griesbach-Schott reading *εἰς τὸ πῦρ*, received by Tischendorff, aptly agrees. Zeller transposes even this into the preparatory, commencing historical judgment of the world, as "the hellish kindling and fury of passions, the infernal fury of heated strife, fires of sedition, etc.," even so accommodating the interpretation of the *burning;* and in this there lies a true thought, but no correct exposition of the text, which evidently speaks of the end, and reaches and must reach into eternity, in order to reach its full conclusion. The *casting* into the fire as the fourth stage of judgment, is the still temporal crisis at the great day of judgment—but in *καίεται* as the *fifth* there follows the unending continuance of suffering in this fire. Of course this is the plural as following *αὐτά*;[1] and the return to the style of speaking which makes

[1] Not as in Nonnus: *ὁ δὲ φλογέῳ πυρὸς ἀτμῷ καίεται.*

Hosted by Google

the collected and rejected ones the subject again, in order to speak out their full doom, is itself significant. But the similitude here ends, it is sufficient no further. It is so far quite appropriate as withered *branches* are useless for anything but the fire (see Ezek. xv., and compare Matt. v. 13; Lu. xiv. 35) —but as the branches are consumed when burned, the aptness of the figure ceases. Those branches of which the Lord here speaks burn on for ever without being consumed. Luther well hits this in his translation of the awful καίεται—*and must burn*, which the corrected version gives—*and must*. Lampe, with a similar meaning, translated *et incendium fit*, and interprets—Concerning the damned the present may always be used; they burn, or they feed the fire.

For the rest, he who is not satisfied with this special development of the process of rejection, and would rather regard the figurative description as merely filling up the details of the similitude, must hold his own opinion; but let him not quarrel with us if we persist in thinking such a rhetorical painting out of the figure altogether inappropriate, and in regarding an exact impression of all the particulars of this wonderful parable as altogether in harmony with its close.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE SIMILITUDE: THE LOVE OF THE LORD IN HIS DISCIPLES BRINGING FORTH ITS FRUIT.

(Ch. xv. 7–17.)

Ver. 7. An unfigurative discourse now follows, which only at the close (ver. 16) returns to the *fruit-bearing*, in order to show that it is no other than a continuous interpretation. After the judgment upon those not abiding has been so fearfully announced, the Lord swiftly turns to consolatory and gracious promise for those who abide. As if He would say—Only those who wilfully forsake Me shall ever thus burn; only apart from Me ye can do nothing and fall to ruin, In Me ye can do all things! Thus now we have the true, attractive, and hortatory explanation of the *main point* which decides—μένειν ἐν ἐμοί.[1]

[1] Which expression, according to Besser's (somewhat uncertain) reckoning, occurs ten times.

Hosted by Google

The *first* abiding, which corresponds with the first cleansing, ver. 3, consists in this, that we abide in His word (ch. viii. 31), and allow the good word of God which has been tasted (Heb. vi. 5) to remain and work its full effect in us. Thus, consequently, *His words* properly abide in us (ch. viii. 37), and these words promise all which is lacking to us, they teach us *prayer* as the way to an ever more perfect *doing*. (Ch. xiv. 13.)[1] The reading *αἰτήσασθε*, restored by Lachmann, appears quite genuine, for it yet more strongly encourages; and the immediate *καὶ γενήσεται* seems more suitable to that than *δοθήσεται*. Ask only, and it shall be, it shall be done unto you! If His words remain in us, His prayer pre-eminently remains in us, as He has taught it and sealed it with His Amen:—such prayer is the fruit of His Spirit in us, and produces ever new and increasing fruit. Its being heard is secure, for we then ask nothing unconditionally personal and external, but everything only with reference to His kingdom, to His and His Father's glory. *What ye will*—but what we will as His disciples, it follows immediately in the next verse—the bringing forth much fruit.

Ver. 8. *Ἐν τούτῳ* does not refer to the previous abiding and asking, as many think, but it is to be construed with *ἵνα*:—by your fruit-bearing will be or is My Father honoured. Comp. here ver. 13, then ch. xvi. 7, xvii. 3, vi. 29, iv. 34; 1 Jno. iv. 17, and what we have remarked concerning this *ἵνα* instead of *ὅτι* upon ch. iv. 34.[2] By this much fruit must not be understood, we repeat, exclusively or even especially the results of

[1] Roos has a subtle remark: "It would not have befitted Him to say—If I abide in you, because that would have seemed to hint that He might fail them. Therefore He said—If My words abide in you, My words, that is, concerning which it was plain that they might or might not keep them. (Ch. xiv. 23, 24.) To keep the Lord Jesus Himself is not a becoming expression."

[2] Thus not with Wahl: On account of this or to this end (*εἰς τοῦτο*) has the Father revealed Himself to you in His glory, *in order that, etc.* Lücke rightly protests against this explanation of *ἐδοξάσθη* as the revelation of the Father through the Son. Fikenscher repeats it, however, and unaptly transposes the thought: "That was the *aim* of His glorification, to make you fruitful in good works!" By no means, God's honour can never be the means to any still further end; but our fruit-bearing honours the Father.

Hosted by Google

their mission, their influence upon others; this is included, but *here* the growth and progress to perfection of the disciples themselves is first of all intended. Nonnus: πίστιος ἔμφρονα καρπόν. For the Lord does not go on to say—that ye may become many, that ye may make many disciples; but—*so shall ye be My disciples*, of which more anon. First we must remark that the Aorist again, ἐδοξάσθη, retains its critical meaning, not being merely instead of the Present, but—Therein *is* at once and ever My Father glorified. (See Winer S. 228.) That the sanctification of the children of God conduces to the honour of *their* Father (for which, however, is here designedly substitued *My Father*), inasmuch as it shines outwardly in their walk, we have found already in Matt. v. 16—and even without this, if we can suppose it wanting, the Father has His honour in the fruit of His grace and culture. Luther: "This means not only that our works appear in the world honourable as good fruit, but that they are carried up to heaven and offered to God, so that He accepts them as His especial honour and highest service." And so those may take courage whose *light* the people will not regard, whose good fruits men turn to scorn!

In the second clause some (Lücke and Lachmann) read γένησθε on account of the ἵνα, or (like the Vulg. efficiamini) at any rate construe the clause in that way, some examples of ἵνα with the future Indicative being found in St John, see Winer S. 238. But we assent to Kling, that the καὶ γενήσεσθε is not parallel with καρπὸν φέρητε, but with ἐδοξάσθη ὁ πατήρ. That is, "the ἐμοί, whether taken as a dat. or as a plur. possess. pron.,[1] appears to indicate a co-ordination with ὁ πατήρ—Therein, that ye bring forth much fruit, is My *Father* glorified, and I shall have in you genuine disciples, who will do Me honour." Bengel's interpretation was just the same; and this alone satisfies our feeling concerning an utterance which would otherwise be wanting in that distinctive complementary reference to the person of Christ in juxtaposition with the Father which is found everywhere else in this discourse. The assertion that they would be disciples (if the ἐμοί did not introduce a new emphasis), as a mere exposition or as the result of the bearing much fruit, would

[1] We prefer the Dative, as in ch. xii. 35.

Hosted by Google

be a feeble supplement. But now this *becoming*, as co-ordinate and synonymous with the growing to yet richer fruit, has a deep emphasis: the Lord places the truth of this high name *μαθηταί* still higher than before in ch. viii. 31. Bengel: fastigium, *esse* discipulum Christi! This consummation of the *discipleship*, as the Father's and the Son's *honour*, so also their own, even for the *Apostles* exhibits a higher aim than their apostolical dignity; it is the *τελεία μαθητεία*, which, according to the apt expression of Euthymius (who puts *ἀπαρτισθήσεσθε* for *γενήσεσθε*), alone can fully glorify and rejoice the Father of Christ.

Vers. 9, 10. But the *common life*, which from the vine-stock pervades the branches, and produces their precious clusters (as their ever new sprouts also); the essential Divine element, so to speak, by means of which this *διδάσκαλος* (ch. xiii. 13), unlike any other, has *μαθητάς* as branches growing upon and from Him, through Him alone bearing fruit—this juice of the Vine, this blood of the Body, this more than mere binding cement of the living Temple (for this last figure is not here sufficient), is *love*. (Eph. iii. 17–19, iv. 16.) Love is the first root-principle in God, the first living germ in us; and perfect love, as God loves, is also the last ripe fruit. Our growth proceeds from love to love, and may therefore be graciously called merely *an abiding in love*, inasmuch as the implanted first love bears in itself already all its consummation, and is the pledge of it under the condition of this *abiding*. But now the love, with which the Lord first loveth His own *in order that* they may also be able to love Him in return and in Him one another also, has its origin and deepest principle in the *love of the Father* (ch. x. 15). We can think of nothing beyond this, nothing greater is to be promised than that the love, in which the Father and the Son through the Spirit are eternally one, should be poured out also in us. (Ch. xvii. 26.) That is not merely the first love of compassion for all the world, which indeed cannot be like the love of the Father to the Son, but that which we shall find in ch. xvi. 27. Hence we must not with Luther begin an altogether new clause with *μείνατε*, but ver. 9 is one connected whole; the *κἀγώ* belongs still to the premiss, as Maldon. and Grot. construe it, and as the obvious comparison with vers. 4, 5, indicates. His love to us is indeed only the further extension and overflowing of the

Hosted by Google

Father's love *to* and *in* Him, and in *this* love we are to continue.[1] And this of itself shows the sole true sense of the *ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ*, concerning which expositors foolishly contend whether it means love to Me or from Me. When Nösselt, Kuinoel, and others understand our love to Jesus, they overlook that the *μένειν* involves a continuation of the *ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς*. When, again, most others (after Cyril, Apollin., Chrys., Augustin, Calvin) regard it as expressing only Christ's love to us, they approach nearer a right understanding, but they are still entangled in an incorrect apprehension of its fulness of meaning.[2] Love, both in ver. 9 and ver. 10, is not to be viewed otherwise than as St John and St Paul elsewhere speak of the *ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ* in us with similar fulness of meaning; so that all love (like all righteousness, according to the formula *δικαιοσύνη τοῦ θεοῦ* which must be interpreted in like manner) is livingly imputed, communicated, and implanted in us at once, from the Father through Christ.[3] As, according to vers. 4, 5, our abiding in Him is only the condition of our retaining His abiding in us, not otherwise is it here. Lampe rightly decided upon the question whether it is His love to us, or our love to Him, by his *utrumque jungendum;* but we would further add that our love *one to another* is actually included also as a necessary consequence. Far back in the apocryphal, but so far genuine, development of the Old Testament doctrine, Wisd. vi. 17–20, all things down to the *ἀφθαρσία* and the *ἐγγὺς εἶναι θεοῦ* is derived from *ἀγάπη* as its original, yea even the *τήρησις νόμων*; but there is now something more than an *ἐγγὺς εἶναι* revealed to us—a real living and loving of God in us, because the Son abideth in us and we in

[1] Ἐγὼ *ἠγάπησα* assuredly refers to the life of the Son in the world, from the time when His love could flow towards and influence them; but the *ἠγάπησέ με* is not similarly to be limited to this earthly life of Jesus (with von Gerlach), but it reaches back into eternity. Christ has brought down, has brought with Him the love of God from the bosom of the Father.

[2] Klee would find the double sense of the expression, first in ver. 10, in *ἀγάπῃ μου*; we cannot see why, since *τῇ ἐμῇ*, rather, more strongly indicates beforehand that all the love of which He speaks, down to vers. 12 and 17, is His own, proceeding solely from Him.

[3] Thus not as Fikenscher thinks, that Jesus, ver. 9, exhorts to an abiding love *towards* Himself, and then first in ver. 10 (a very incorrect inversion!) assures us of His abiding love towards us.

Hosted by Google

the Son, as the Father in the Son and the Son in the Father. But as there, so here, ver. 10 is supplementarily added for defence against all self-deception concerning this indwelling life, giving us the test of *keeping the commandments;* and this must be understood precisely as in ch. xiv. 15. The Lord *has loved* His own unto the end, which is here ever thought of as already come; even so He hath kept down to His departure the Father's commandment and commission, in His state of humiliation He hath preserved His obedience in analogy with ourselves, *and* so He abideth in His Father's love.[1] Mark the transition into the Present μένω, which at once embraces His glorification; and the αὐτοῦ which expressly comes first, according to which even in Christ the eternal love of the Father appears as the sole, abiding, impulsive principle of all His life and suffering, of all His acts and of all His love.

Ver. 11. Ταῦτα λελάληκα is again an anticipation, hastening on to His departure, as if He would close and had already closed. *My joy in you* is as wide and deep in its meaning as the *love;* but now the two critical points for our understanding the sense are designedly separated. First comes the explanatory ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν (the centre of the whole discourse) which gives us the true solution; and then is mentioned the χαρὰ ὑμῶν which flows from the former. Most expositors have, from the earliest times, overshot the true sense through a misapplied logical division, which cannot or will not enter into the mystery of the new language concerning the union between Christ and us. That ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ cannot be—your joy *in Me*, concerning Me and My departure,[2] is plain in the very words, for this pronoun could scarcely be so used; and, moreover, ch. xiv. 28 taught us that He also still found *this* joy wanting in the disciples. Most have applied themselves to defend the translation of ἐν ὑμῖν (though quite in opposition to the fundmental notion of ἐν throughout this discourse) thus—My *joy in or over you.* Augustin: Quid est gaudium Christi in nobis, nisi quod dignatur gaudere de nobis? So also, *e.g.*, Gerhard, Cocceius, Lampe, Heumann, Zeltner (in the Altorf Bible), the Hirschberg Bible, Kuinoel, Hess ("I say this unto you, in order that I may be

[1] Nonnus: ἀπονεύμενος (abiens) εἰσέτι μίμνω.

[2] As Theophyl., Euthym., Nonn., Grot., Nösselt, etc., thought.

Hosted by Google

able to continue My joy over you"); and Lücke earlier, "the joy of Christ over His disciples, if they should continue in love to Him." But Kling protests against this, and compares the εἰρήνη of ch. xiv. 27. And Lücke afterwards rightly explains, admitting this: "the joy of Christ is His own sacred bliss, the joy of the holy Son in the consciousness of the love of God, of His unity with the Father; comp. ver. 10." This is more correct than v. Gerlach's only approximate, and mediating view, according to which we must first hold fast that "the joy of Christ is the happiness which He experienced *in looking upon His new creation*, His believing, loving, fruit-bearing disciples"—thus still making ἐν ὑμῖν, over you—and then after He assures them of His divine joy, His gracious good-pleasure *in them*, it passes over to themselves, and "His joy becomes the incessantly streaming source of their joy." O no, that is (if we may so speak) much too Pauline a derivation of their joy from an assuring justification utterance—I have My joy in you! for in the mind of Christ, according to St John, the ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν indicates the living interchange of fellowship.

We must not, once more, with Cyril, Erasmus, Meyer, and others, limit the thought to the *kind* of joy which Christ had, that is, in heavenly things, in the love of the Father, with a tacit opposition to false, earthly joy; as if He meant—that ye may learn to find your joy where I do! This is far from the sense here, and only spoils the thought, as deep as it is simple. *Christ* has in Himself and retains *joy*, not merely peace: this He testifies here on the way to His passion, for that is no other than His glorification! He rejoices in His departure (Bengel and Semler lay the emphasis upon this), but He also rejoices generally and always as abiding in the love of the Father, and further He already rejoices, doubtless, over His disciples—but this last does not lie in the ἐν ὑμῖν, if there at all it comes in after the rest. All *His* joy and "*joyousness*"[1] would from this time (that is, when the truth and reality of His proleptic words should be made present by His Spirit) pass over into His disciples, and make its abode in them. Thus "*My joy*" is pre-eminently the joy which He Himself has, but then immediately "*might remain*

[1] As B.-Crusius well says, referring to the antithesis with *troubled*, ch. xiv. i. 27. Compare also *peace and joy*, Rom. xiv. 17.

Hosted by Google

in you" makes it the joy which He gives, of which He is the foundation and source, as Calvin views it: comp. ch. xvii. 13, and 1 Jno. i. 4, for the πληροῦσθαι. Consequently, and to obviate once more a too external meaning, "*your joy*" is by no means only their joy "in Him and His work" (as Lücke first said), but the gladness in God which flowed from Him into them. The joy of Jesus of course required no πληροῦσθαι, for He had it from the beginning, brought with Him from eternity;[1] our joy is made perfect *out of His*, the more fully we grow together with Him and bring forth fruit. B.-Crusius, who at first had a presentiment of the right meaning, most rationalistically perverts it when he says, "*Your joy* may be that gladness which they might have had *already in themselves*; thus—That your own joy may increase more and more, and My higher joy be *added* unto it!" Here there is no *being added*, but all is entirely in and from Him. Finally, it is not a contradiction, but strictly conformable to the spirit of the whole discourse, which recognises both abiding and increasing in this abiding, that concerning the same joy μένειν is first used, and then πληροῦσθαι is added. Lachmann's reading ᾖ for μείνῃ[2] is quite groundlessly defended by Lücke and Luthardt; by Lücke, because the gladness in the disciples could be regarded as arising only after the abatement of their sorrow: but he overlooks, what is obvious throughout the chapter, that the ground of their fellowship with Jesus is actually already established, and we would rather say with B.-Crusius that the previous words concerning *continuance* are here carried on.[3]

Vers. 12, 13. Alluding to ch. xiii. 34, the Lord adds in repetition the new thought touching the greatness of that love which lays life down for others, thus paving the way for the great word that He now called His own His *friends*. Αὕτη ἐστίν makes markedly prominent this *one thing*, in which all specific *com-*

[1] Even Augustine, who, as before quoted, understands His gaudium de nobis as gratia, quam præstitit nobis, says also: Nec possumus dicere, quod gaudium ejus plenum non erat, non enim Deus imperfecte aliquando gaudebat. See the entire passage in Klee.

[2] In the Vulg. and Syr. expressly used (תְּהֵוֵא—sit); recognised in the Gnomon by Bengel, but afterwards retracted.

[3] The ᾖ might have only arisen, either from an error of transcription [μεὲν] ᾖ, as Mill—or, as Bengel and Schott thought, from the similarity of sound in ὑμῖν.

Hosted by Google

mandments, ver. 10, are wrapped up; *here* the ἵνα is obviously the explanatory ὅτι—for the comparison with ταῦτα λελάληκα ἵνα, ver. 11 (depending on which αὕτη *might*, indeed, be made to refer to all that preceded, and ἵνα taken in its natural meaning,—but this would be too artificial), is outweighed by the other parallel, ver. 8, ἐν τούτῳ ἵνα, as well as by the obvious allusion to the *commandment* given in ch. xiii. Moreover, in ver. 13, we have a similar ταύτης ἵνα again. But the declaration, asserted with a rigorous οὐδείς, that there is no *greater* love than to lay down life for *friends*, has in its reference to our Lord Himself something strange, as every one must feel. We cannot say that He spoke *merely* of what *we* may do among ourselves, because in ver. 14 there immediately follows an application to Himself and His disciples. It is manifest that our Lord graciously condescends so deeply to a comparison with our human relations, that He, as it were, leaves out of sight for a time the all-embracing, and in the solitary sense atoning, character of His death: comp. what we remarked upon Matt. xx. 28. Richter makes the same observation: Here the Lord does not speak (primarily) of the redeeming design of His death, as in Rom. v. 8, etc.,[1] but of that point of similarity in great love, which we may recognise and imitate. Satan, in Job ii. 4, describes rightly the selfish natural man, to whom to preserve his life and save his skin is the supreme object, but there have been on the other hand, through the prevenient grace of Christ, examples even among the heathen of the sacrifice of life for friends:—comp. Rom. v. 7, where the same is still more closely restricted to a thankful love toward benefactors. Even the future love of the disciples of Christ would not overpass this measure of love, than which there is none greater: more than this therefore will not be required, 1 Jno. iii. 16. Only that in these commenting parallels it is made more clear than here, that the disciples of *Christ* regard in Him and after His example those whom the world would call their enemies, as their friends and brethren, even as they love their souls. And in this we have the reconciling explanation of the word that our Lord lays down His life only for His *friends*—in apparent contradiction to that affecting and profound passage, Rom. v. 8–10. We must not,

[1] Nonnus therefore speaks improperly of λύτρον ἑῶν ἑτάρων!

Hosted by Google

therefore, say with von Gerlach, "This entire discourse of Jesus lingers in His simple relation to His friends; hence the meaning —*Toward his friends* man can show no greater love." For the inversion which throws the ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων by anticipation into the unconditional οὐδεὶς ἔχει which comes first, is altogether unjustified; and we have seen from the πᾶν κλῆμα, ver. 2 downward, with what far-reaching glance the Lord regards these disciples as representatives of all future disciples. This much is true, that on the one hand the Lord did actually die—quoad effectum—only for His friends or His sheep, the children of God scattered abroad, see ch. x. 12, 15, 16, xi. 52. But, on the other hand, the qualification of this must be sought in bringing forward from the background of this word, which so condescendingly draws this comparison with the greatest exhibition of our poor human love, the thought, which is more than merely an edifying appendage, that—Jesus calls even sinners and enemies, whom He desires to save, His friends, inasmuch as and because He is first their friend (Lu. vii. 34). This vindication of His deeper meaning actually follows afterward in vers. 15, 16—I have first called you and made you friends, I have chosen and ordained you. Hence Lücke, like Luther, has no hesitation in putting these passages together. Luther: "Ye were before enemies, but ye are now friends, because I hold you as friends, not that ye have done any good to Me, according to the world's notion of friends—to them I do good in vain. I die for such friends as have never done Me any good; only I have loved them and made them friends." Lücke: "The love wherewith, according to St Paul, He dieth for sinners, is at the same time the love whereby, according to St John, He maketh the disciples His friends. He dies for sinners, only because in the fulness of His love He regards them as friends."

Ver. 14. The disciples assuredly referred that "greatest love, the laying down life for friends," although the Lord spoke touching their ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους, first of all and pre-eminently to His own ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς. Then are *we* His friends? We miserable men, whose weakness and folly have wrought Him already so much distress? We sinners the *friends* of the Holy One, the Son of God? That was the thought which immediately sprang up in their minds, and the Lord impressively con-

Hosted by Google

firms it—*Ye are!* But with two modifications He confirms it. First, there is the less warning than encouraging *note for the future*, which unites friendship with obedience towards their *commanding* Friend—Ye are (and shall be) such, if ye do what I command you.[1] Then, in order to avert a legal misunderstanding of this ἐντέλλομαι, comes the distinctive declaration of vers. 15, 16—Through My word, in My voluntary love, I make you and call you My friends! Lampe's comment is quite correct: "They are wrong who follow Salmeron in deducing from this passage that *the Gospel is not a bare promise of grace, but hedged in by a condition.* There is no condition of friendship with Jesus here proposed. He prescribes *precepts* for the future; but He already declared them to be friends, and He had before regarded them so, as the following clause shows."

Ver. 15. Glassius finds it easy to assert that οὐκέτι stands merely for οὐκ, but exegesis will not tolerate this any longer. The reason which he adduces has in it some ground of truth,—"Christ had never called the disciples *servants* in that sense in which the name is opposed to friends, and denotes a state of servile fear and despotic restraint; but He had always conversed with them, in the most friendly manner, as His friends." The οὐκέτι, on the other hand, maintains its strict propriety, inasmuch as the only passage in which He had ever called them friends, and which is always quoted, Lu. xii. 4 (with which John xi. 11 is to be combined), is far from having the meaning which the word has here, as a developed contrast with "servant." In the Synoptical parables they are always servants, and Lu. xvii. 7–10 is strong enough, indeed, for this rigorous idea. In John xiii. 13, 16, the same was said of which they are here (ch. xv. 20) again reminded, for a testimony that the servant-relation was not to be abolished but to be glorified; but the distinction holds good, that only from this time, when the Spirit should bring to their minds the truth of these *last* sayings, should the full freedom and joy of the *love* of their Lord rise up in their souls. The proof of the relation of friendship is that open, confidential, unrestrained communion, the typical expressions of

[1] The ὅσα is probably a well-intentioned but incorrect strengthening of the proper reading ἅ, for "that which He now imposes upon them to keep (commits, entrusts), is no other than *love*, ver. 17."

Hosted by Google

which are found in the Old Testament—in Abraham's case, Gen. xviii. 17 (hence Jas. ii. 23; Isa. xli. 8; 2 Chron. xx. 7) —that of Moses, Ex. xxxiii. 11—of the pious generally, Ps. xxv. 14; Prov. iii. 32; Amos iii. 7; Job xxix. 4. But how far above that סוֹד יְהוָה is this declaration, that the Son makes known to His own all that He hath heard of the Father, utters and commits to their fidelity the entire, full truth of the last revelation! A qualification of this *πάντα* may be thought to be found in ch. xvi. 12—but these different sayings are perfectly accordant, since the Lord had actually made known unto them all that He had heard and received of the Father for them, and this so entirely embraced the whole truth that the subsequent revelation of the Spirit should be only an explanation and development of the Words of the Son.[1]

Ver. 16. Finally, as said above, though the Lord calls us friends, this does not by any means imply such an equality and reciprocation as exist between human friends. He calls His followers afterwards even *brethren*, but they all the more reverently call Him only their Lord and their God.[2] That which the Lord, preserving His majesty in His condescension, and asserting His own prerogative as the Vine, goes on to say, is only the New Testament expression of what we find already in Isa. xliii. 21–25, the immovable, plainly announced but unfathomable mystery of election. Not according to Augustin's views of prescience and predestination, but as Rom. viii. 29, rightly expounded, speaks of it. (See on this passage, Klee's note, S. 407.) The truth of the saying which we have now before us remains—The love between us began with Me and not with you! (1 Jno. iv. 10.) Not ye have chosen Me:—

[1] B.-Crusius is altogether incorrect in his conclusion, that "they now know even *as* the Son knew—for not merely the object of their knowledge, but the method of it, is here referred to." By no means; for no man but the Son hath *heard immediately of the Father*, comp. ch. vi. 46.

[2] Only in the Old-Testament tone of the typical Canticles, is it permitted to us to speak of our "Friend." Else, in the spirit of the New Testament it is unscriptural, though our modern sentimental hymns and prayers may make thus bold. In the author's hymn, "Herr Jesu Christe, Gottes Sohn" (Krummacher's Zionsharfe N. 168. Rauschenbusch Missions-Gesangbuch, N. 174), the line "Du Freund voll Milde und Gedabuld" is an unjustifiable insertion by another hand.

Hosted by Google

there may be in this (as Whitby says) an *allusion* to the custom of disciples choosing their own Rabbis in Israel, whereas the Lord had spontaneously called His disciples; but the meaning reaches much beyond this, as the relation is much more profound. The discourse here is of choosing and ordaining for fruit, consequently of an ἐκλέγεσθαι which can have no application to Judas, though he also was chosen in another sense.

How is ἔθηκα to be understood? It is generally, and without qualification, taken according to the apostolical usage, as in Acts xiii. 47, xx. 28; 1 Thess. v. 9; 1 Tim. i. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 8. We do not deny that the meaning of the expression tends to that, inasmuch as it appears to be parallel with ἐξελέξαμην, as its consequence and development; but we would not altogether reject the ancient comment of Chrys., Euthym., and Theoph., who explain this ἔθηκα by ἐφύτευσα. (Comp. שׂוּם, Isa. xxviii. 25; Heb., Ezek. xvii. 4, and in Sept. ἔθετο.) For it is evident that the Lord returns, in the clause following, to the figure; and inasmuch as ἔθηκα in this transition is connected with ἵνα καρπον φέρητε, this interpretation is not unwarranted, and does not by any means carry the figure beyond its prescribed limits. And this gives a good reason for the remark of Theophylact (hinted at in ver. 3), that the Son here again, like the Father, appears as a γεωργός and Planter of vines. The *branches* become elevated, as it were, themselves into new *vines* of the second degree, since the Lord sets them to bear fruit. For (as Fikenscher well says, on this occasion) "He who is *united with* Christ, obtains thereby the true *independence*, and stands before God as a personality pervaded by Christ." In the same middle-tone between parable and interpretation we understand (though without contending for it) the appended ὑπάγειν. It is assuredly incorrect—since that would be indeed (Olshausen) to mix the unfigurative and figurative together—to interpret this ὑπάγειν, with Grotius and Lampe, of the going forth of the Apostles on their missionary labours:—excitantur apostoli, ut non exspectent, dum homines discendi avidi ad se veniant, *sed ipsi ultro eos quærant!*[1] This needs no refutation. Conse-

[1] Similarly, Luther too: "that ye sit not still without work and fruit, but show yourselves publicly, that other people may have the good of you." Lange, again: "They were to go forth into the world, like Himself!"

Hosted by Google

quently, we must connect this *ὑπάγειν* closely with *καρπὸν φέρειν*, taking it figuratively in allusion to the increasing, spreading branches; for which we have the support of the well-known Hebraism of הלך and יסף for increasing in anything, going on to "more and more." See Ex. xix. 19 (Sept. *προβαίνουσαι*)—2 Sam. iii. 1; Jon. i. 11 (Sept. *ἐπορεύετο*)—Prov. iv. 18 (Sept. *προπορεύονται*)—to which some have also referred the *πορευόμενοι συμπνίγονται* of Lu. viii. 14, in their seeming growth they are choked, etc.[1] Hence Chrys., Euthym., Theoph., *ἵνα ἐκτείνησθε αὐξανόμενοι*; and in Seiler's N. T. we have it plainly translated—"that ye may increase, and bring forth more and more fruit." On the other hand, this is an unusual meaning of *ὑπάγειν*, which certainly seems to allude more or less to the actual life and energy of individual persons; and we, therefore, with Luther, Baum.-Crusius, de Wette, Lücke, Luthardt, vibrating between figure and reality, would say that it is simply an expression of living energy—as a man goes forth to work in a not idle course, as a plant through the vigour of its internal life increases and spreads.

It is abundantly plain that the *fruit* is not to be understood of external results, of winning and converting others specifically, for it was to remain to the fruit-bearers themselves (*καρπὸς ὑμῶν*), as their own most precious possession and gain. Bengel: vobis seritur, vobis metitur—to be explained by Rom. vi. 22. The fruit is not the ever-abiding church which the Apostles have founded (see Apollinarius in Lampe), for this reason, that the Lord addresses in these Apostles His future disciples also, and such as have no missionary vocation; but it is the consummation of personal salvation, their ripening into men of God, full, indeed, of good works and all holy activity, each in his own sphere. And even when the inscription over Zinzendorf—"He was ordained that he should bring forth fruit, and fruit that should remain"—does not, as in his case, demonstrate itself before the eyes of the world, the fruit of every living branch will abide, nevertheless, as its own in the form of those works of righteousness which follow the believer. (Rev. xiv. 13.)

The second *ἵνα* cannot possibly be subordinate to the first, as

[1] Different from our exposition of the passage—they go forth with utter indecision.

Hosted by Google

Lücke at first thought, taking it ἐκβατικῶς for ὥστε, and thus regarding "the whole clause as a close definition of the gradation of apostolical work and influence." We cannot realise the precise meaning of the idea, that they were to bring forth so much fruit, or in such a manner, that they might as the result thereof more effectually pray. For their prayer would itself be fruit, while it is also in vers. 7, 8 the way to secure that fruit. Olshausen is right in denying that *prayer* could be regarded as the final *end* of the Divine calling and planting; but his own explanation that "they should bring forth fruit, *abiding* fruit, *so that they might enter into that internal relation to God* from which prayer in the name of the Lord proceeds," is highly obscure and artificial. Would not this, apart from the forced change of the concrete ὅ, τι ἂν αἰτησήτε, etc., into the principle of a general relation, be a ὕστερον πρότερον still,—first the fruit, and that increasing and permanent to eternity, and then as a *consequence* the power and the right to ask of the Father? Consequently, we must, with Lücke's later view, decide that the ἵνα in both cases is parallel and co-ordinate,—"because the fruit-bearing of the disciples is no other than the proof and attestation of the power of their prayer in the name of Jesus."[1] And still more clearly—because it cannot be produced save in this way, through continuance in ever-receiving prayer. Thus the prayer is by no means the *final* end of the planting, that must be the mature fruit, but it is added with retrospective reference, in order to show how it should proceed in the whole ὑπάγειν from the first ἔθηκα ὑμᾶς:—I have planted and appointed you that ye should bring forth fruit, *that is*, that ye should secure fruit by your effectual prayer.

Ver. 17. This verse is sometimes improperly regarded as the

[1] We cannot understand how Münchmeyer can consider this as "very forced;" to us it appears conformable both to the language (even without the καί of co-ordination) and to the matter. Luthardt thinks it grammatically harsh, but how is it so? Alford, who is generally disposed to be philologically keen enough, takes no objection to this, but says, "This ἵνα is parallel with the former, not the result of it; the two, the bringing forth of fruit and the obtaining answer to prayer, being co-ordinate with each other; but (vers. 7, 8) the bearing fruit to God's glory is of these the greater, being the result and aim of the other." This gives occasion to this unwonted, but not inadmissible form of speech.

Hosted by Google

commencement of another section, but it is the summing up and conclusion of what has gone before. *Ταῦτα* is taken by Tholuck and B.-Crusius for *τοῦτο*, and there are examples which may be adduced; but for the simple statement of the one commandment (*αὕτη*, ver. 12), such a plural seems to us quite inappropriate.[1] We are convinced that *ταῦτα*, as always in St John (or almost always), refers back to what has preceded, embracing not only what had immediately, but also what had more distantly, preceded—once more as in ver. 11.[2] The Vulg. has, Hæc mando vobis ut.—We understand the Lord to say—By all these My discourses and commandments I would specially point you to that One which I would confirm in your hearts, *that ye love one another!* Thus does He ever return to that *ἐντολὴ καινή*, though here it is no mere repetition—This I command you! once more. The disciples are to love *one another—not* then the world without? We have already given our answer at length on chap. xiii. Should they hate, or scorn, the world? Far be it, this is never found in all our Lord's sayings. But in spite of all their love the world will hate *them*, and the Lord's meaning in *ἀλλήλους* seems to contain a *transition* to the needful remarks which He would now make upon that subject. As Ammonius has observed: *ὡς μελλόντων μισεῖσθαι παρὰ πάντων, παραγγέλλει αὐτοῖς ἀγαπᾷν ἀλλήλους*—though it does not necessarily follow from this view that *ταῦτα ἵνα* is to be taken for *τοῦτο ὅτι*.

[1] Fikenscher helps himself little by saying—"The Lord had previously, vers. 10 and 12, exhibited the commandment of love as *several* and *single;* moreover, love is regarded as contained in its manifestation, good works." Let him whom this pleases, be satisfied with it!

[2] Münchmeyer thinks this *quite erroneous*, because in that case we must have had the Perfect as in ver. 11—a very weak reason! And because *ἐντέλλεσθαι* is not *λαλεῖν*—which is equally inconclusive, for in these discourses the Lord has used *ἐντολαί μου, λόγος, ῥήματα*, as we have seen, interchangeably,—comp. Matt. xxviii. 20. Finally he contends that with *ἐντέλλομαι* and *ἐντολή* the substance of the command is introduced always by *ἵνα*. Now *ἐντέλλεσθαι* is not elsewhere found with *ἵνα*; *ἐντολή* is thrice, chap. xi. 57, xiii. 34, xv. 12; but this gives no absolute law of usage. Luthardt unhesitatingly agrees, that ver. 17 *looking back* and *embracing* all that had been said, forms a transition to a new subject.

Hosted by Google

THE HATRED OF THE WORLD TO THE DISCIPLES OF THEIR LORD: THE INEXCUSABLE SIN OF UNBELIEF.

(Chap. xv. 18–25.)

Ver. 18. When in our general analysis of the whole we said that the ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους awakened anew the thought of the world's hatred, we spoke only in the ordinary style of such analysis. Not as if the Lord did actually come to speak, through the suggestion of the word concerning brotherly love, of that world which would not suffer itself to be drawn within the circle of love. He had already in chap. xiv. strongly laid down the contrast and the distinction between His disciples and the world; from beginning to end (see chap. xvii.), it was indispensable that He should give to His own, for their subsequent encouragement, plain pre-intimations of the world's hatred and persecution. Since ver. 14 it seems probable that the *enemies* were in His thought who would be distinguished from these *friends;* hence one might in ver. 17 hear such an undertone as this, preparing for the subsequent sentence—Yea, there is need that ye should be all the more closely united in My love, *for* the world hateth you! We doubt much whether we can accept the meaning which Richter inlays into the words—"Against this great hatred ye must find your great *compensation* in love, the blessedness of which maketh the bitter sweet;" since this developed thought rather *presupposes* than leads to the words concerning the hatred of the world.[1]

A loving heart would fain find or create love everywhere: to be ungratified in that desire, and more than that to be *hated*, is a hard and bitter lot, the bitterest ingredient in all affliction. Therefore the Lord discreetly and faithfully prepares them for this, that they may not marvel at this destiny or count it a strange thing, as the Evangelist in his Epistle (1 John iii. 13) has expanded the theme. They must for their own part love and preserve peace, do nothing, which they may omit without sin, to provoke or warrant the hatred of the world: therefore

[1] Still less "that it may sound the alarm for strife." (Rieger.)

Hosted by Google

He speaks deliberately with an *If* concerning this lamentable and unavoidable circumstance. In His further explanation it appears plain that to be hated of the world will be a necessary consequence and an inseparable mark of His true discipleship; nevertheless He speaks *here* not so much for the condemnation and warning of those gentle ones who do not disoblige the world, as for the pure encouragement of oppressed and discomfited souls. The most conscientious and tender Christian is the most likely to fall into the temptation of seeking the cause of the world's hatred solely in himself, of thinking that if he were perfect in goodness, love, humility, and meekness, the evil of the world must needs be overcome. And this again might lead to a false compliance, and a renunciation of the rigour of His word. Against *such* trouble and such temptation the Lord arms us beforehand: He teaches us to perceive and bethink ourselves that he who will not be holily loved, and return our love, cannot even by God Himself be overcome and constrained; He sets before us as proof the pattern and testimony of His own treatment in this evil world. "If the most holy love upon earth fared no better, if He did not succeed, if He could not in His wisdom avoid hatred when it arose against Him, all the more fiercely as His pure love more brightly beamed upon it—How could *we* hope altogether to escape this hatred? Or do we vainly imagine that we can surpass the love and the prudence of our Lord?" (Dietz.)

In the same sense as in ch. vii. 7 Jesus had already spoken of the hatred of the world, being constrained to utter to His *unbelieving brethren* the mournful word, The world *cannot* hate *you*, because ye still belong to it;—He now assures His believing and devoted disciples on the other side, The world *cannot* love you, it must hate you *as* it hates *Me!* That is the presupposed ground for the abruptly beginning, *If* it hate you—spoken rather for the future than the present, like everything in these discourses. These poor disciples had hitherto but little experienced the direct hatred of the world against *their* unimportant persons; that which their Master had foretold, when He sent them on their trial mission (Matt. x.), still waited for the main part of its accomplishment; it was probably almost forgotten before, but must now have been revived in their re-

Hosted by Google

membrance. But that the world hated *Jesus*, and already for some time had threatened His death, they knew very well: see ch. xi. 8. Of that He now says γινώσκετε: think well what this means, and what will follow from it to yourselves; that ye may know and prepare to suffer that hatred which will be essential to My discipleship. Πρῶτον ὑμῶν is to be taken adverbially—*before* you, even if it follows the form of ch. i. 15 πρῶτός μου.[1] And in this is already intimated, for the reflecting γινώσκειν, the immediately afterward expounded *cause* of the hatred; for in the new *beginning* which the Lord introduced—in which He provoked and experienced the full hatred of the world—lies also the *ground* of a similar relation for His followers as belonging to Him. In connection with which it is self-understood that to our pondering the Lord's words as it were run on—And nevertheless *love* this world, as I have loved it!

Ver. 19. Five times with emphasis is the *world* mentioned in this single verse. Would ye then—this is what the Lord designs so strongly to emphasize—rather be loved of the world? That would be wretched indeed; for then—ye *would be* also of the world! (1 Jno. iv. 5.) The οὐκ εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, which in ch. viii. 23 He had asserted of Himself (even there, properly speaking, humbling Himself to a level with His disciples, in opposition to the unbelievers and evil), He now most expressly for the first time attributes to His own. They are, indeed, in the world, and were to remain in it, like His kingdom, and like Himself at first (ch. xiii. 1, xvii. 14–18; 1 Jno. iv. 17)—but no more from and of the world, since He had chosen them, and implanted in them a new principle of life from above, since they had become branches of the Vine planted by the Father upon the earth. If they were still of the world, the world would love *its own*—but that is not merely as it is superficially and generally interpreted, Because like

[1] Cyril, Cajetan, Cocceius would translate principem vestrum; and Calvin preferred this—that Christ, although the greatest and highest, and so far above them, nevertheless escaped not the enmity of the world. But we hold fast, with Syr., Vulg., Nonnus, and most others, the more simple view: I have *gone before* you in this, have broken *this* path! De Wette: I have first undergone this lot, let this be your comfort.

Hosted by Google

seeks like. (Ecclus. xiii. 15–17.) Euthymius indeed comments in that style: *χαίρει γὰρ τῷ ὁμοίῳ τὸ ὅμοιον*—and in van Ess it is concisely translated, "*you as* their fellows." But *τὸ ἴδιον* is not just *τὸ ὅμοιον*; a much deeper thought lies in this expression. It is the manner of the world to seek *its own;* therefore where and when it *loves,* it is the character of this false, so-called "love," which in its selfishness contradicts the nature of all true love, that it in others essentially seeks only *its own.* (Comp. on Matt. v. 46.) Therefore the Lord selects His expression, as we see when we examine it closely: this world would—not indeed love *you* (for it cannot truly *love* at all!)—but *its own in you,* that is, so far and so long as it finds that in you. And this leaves room for Lampe's remark, which contains a truth attested by experience: "It is not indeed sincere love, but mere *φιλαυτία,* in that the world loves in the worldly what is its own. For although worldly men often quarrel fiercely, which is one of the characteristics of corrupt nature, Tit. iii. 3, yet these enmities are only about particular conflicting interests. *In the great essentials there is always a perfect accord among them.*" Even he who holds with the world must not expect for his own person only love and peace; it is only where opposition to Christ and the kingdom of God is concerned that the world will recognise its principle in him and altogether hold his side.

The first thing, on the other hand, which provokes the world's hatred is the aim to be different and better—which is given here at first in the *ἐξελεξάμην*: the world feels itself aggrieved and injured by such a pretension to election, and repels it as pride—until, comforted by the thought that it is only *pretension,* it falls back upon its own again. But when the world cannot but know that we no longer *are* of it, and, more than that, as we *testify,* through that *Christ* whom the world from the beginning (*πρῶτον*) hated—then indeed is its full hatred excited. *Διὰ τοῦτο* thus refers (as ver. 18 already deduced this conclusion from *ἐμέ* to *ὑμᾶς*) specifically to the previous prominent *ἐγώ,* in which B.-Crusius could find no direct significance. It has indeed a twofold important significance. First, as we have said—It is the ground of their strongest hatred that *I* have robbed the world of you. Again, it gives the disciples a whole-

Hosted by Google

some remembrancer, in order to quell all hatred and counter-scorn on their part (just as Tit. iii. 2–5), that even they were formerly φύσει (Eph. ii. 1–3) children of the world; and thus with great emphasis ascribes their ἐκλέγεσθαι altogether to *Himself*. For we must take into account, what is declared ch. xvii. 6 and will there be expounded, that these disciples at least were already, previously to their last decisive calls to Jesus, τέκνα θεοῦ of the old covenant; nevertheless the Lord says, including this also—I have chosen you out of the world: just as in Matt. xxiii. 37 He shows Himself to have ever been the source of all calling to Jerusalem and Israel. Thus the ἐγώ has a twofold emphasis: as to the *world*, its hatred is reduced into hatred against Himself; as to the *disciples*, it is correspondingly impressed upon them, that He alone is the origin of their new life, even that of their preparatory election.

Thus in the explanatory διὰ τοῦτο the hatred of the world becomes to us a precious *note* that we are His. Not indeed the first or the only mark; that is rather the *loving one another*, the *continuing in His love* until we, like Himself, can love the hating world. As the *second* note, it neither begins our test, nor must we seek it or wish it; but *if*, alas, it incessantly comes, *then* it is time to comfort ourselves in the reflection that the love of the world would be a sad condemnation: Luke vi. 26; Gal. i. 10; Jas. iv. 4, etc.

Ver. 20. An explanatory *remember* follows *ye know*. It is the Lord's will that we should forget no word ever spoken by Him. Yet λόγος has here the specific meaning of *adagium*, as in ch. iv. 37, and as we shall afterwards find in ver. 25. The application now given to this saying is by no means a new one (see already Matt. x. 24, 25), by no means an altogether different one from ch. xiii. 16 (to which the εἶπον ὑμῖν primarily refers); for we saw that even there something of the same kind was the undertone of meaning. But it has a subtile significance which few find in it,—that the Lord reckons here as His own honour the being hated and persecuted, and suffering: He experienced all this not merely as πρῶτος, but as κύριος, as Lord and Head. Consequently, the consolation has an undertone of demand, that they should rejoice and feel themselves honoured in being counted worthy to suffer as He suffered. (Acts v. 41;

Hosted by Google

1 Pet. iv. 13, 14.) Should we be, *would* we be, *less* than He? "Thus it belongs to the *perfection* of a disciple, who would be as his Master, that he should encounter the hatred of the world" —as Braune excellently brings out this neglected meaning.

The εἰ in the following specific unfolding of the general λόγος is of course ætiological, as the εἰ and the ὅτι in the previous verse; it is founded upon those previous sayings, and presupposes them. *If* ye are My servants and followers, then must that other immediately hold good—*If* they have persecuted the Lord, they will also persecute the servant. The saying, which is repeated *e.g.* in 2 Tim. iii. 12, not only in general retains its truth, but so absolutely that no one can be excepted; although a superficial understanding of it has led to much anxious questioning whether the discipleship of one not actually persecuted can be genuine.[1] For there is a very subtile (often all the more keen on that account) διώκειν, even as there is a very honourable and seemingly Christian world around us; but the *hatred* of the heart, consequently also its expression, against all who would with all their soul live godly in Christ Jesus, is never wanting. The general tolerance of a tolerant world is always grazing the limits of its liberality, where its secret principle becomes manifest, and its concealed hatred to Christ in His people must break out; when the *I have chosen you out of the world* is obtruded upon them in all its earnestness, then begins their exclusion, their ban, their rage.

But what of the τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον, which as thus connected with the διώκειν, has been the cause to expositors from the beginning, and to almost every reader, of so much trouble? The old expedient is well known, which Bengel also adopts,—that of taking, on account of the "parallel," τηρεῖν for παρατηρεῖν, thus maliciously to watch the words, to pervert them, etc. But there is no authority to be adduced for such a use of the word; the only passage, τηρήσει, Gen. iii. 15, is quite peculiar in its kind, and is moreover very uncertain; such places as Matt. xxvii. 36, 54 can be brought forward only through entire misunderstanding. It is out of the question to apply St John's τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον, retaining as it does the same sense throughout the

[1] As in many of the conferences at Barmen—and probably elsewhere.

Hosted by Google

Scriptures, in malam partem, and to give it an evil meaning.[1] Winer would help the matter by explaining the double clause as a general indefinite and hypothetic evolution of the one λόγος, viewed in two aspects. "Your lot will be like Mine: *but that can be only twofold,* persecution *or* acceptance. *The words themselves leave it undecided at the moment, which of these two lots befell Jesus.*" But this tame generalisation, which would leave that for a moment undecided which has just been so strongly declared, can do little to enlighten us; and it contradicts the spirit of that solemn and deep feeling in which the Lord speaks throughout this discourse. Indeed, even in οὐκ ἔστι μείζων as *here* used there lay a reference to διώκειν and μισεῖν. It is not merely—He has no *other* fate, only if the Lord finds *acceptance,* the servant finds it. To translate, with Kuinoel: si meam doctrinam *observassent,* Lücke rightly declares to be wholly incorrect; for this would require also a *si persecuti essent,* the εἰ, connected as it is with the εἰ and ὅτι of ver. 19, would lose its entire force, and the whole saying its decisive earnestness. Lücke agrees with Winer in allowing no irony here, and thinks (though disagreeing with Winer in this) that it was left to the disciples to draw the conclusion that they would *chiefly* experience persecution (though also, with that, some slight acceptance), like Himself. Quite right, if only the εἰ did not stand in each case in so manifestly *contrasting* a sense, so that in both cases, in the διώκειν or in the τηρεῖν, their *entire* lot is embraced! This last meaning is necessarily obtruded upon us in spite of ourselves; quite other would be, *In as far as* it has persecuted Me,—*as much* or *as little as* it has kept My words or accepted Me.[2] The subject of ἐδίωξαν and ἐτήρησαν is manifestly quite the same, the *hating world* now referred to in the plural. And

[1] Braune, whom we quoted before with approbation, here follows Rieger in his error, who (after Bengel) could write:—It provokes those who have the power to *persecution,* others to *crafty spying.*

[2] Many, however, contend, with all kinds of applications, for an earnest promise of some measure of acceptance for their words. Olshausen: "But as many have kept My word, so will there be some who will receive yours." B.-Crusius: "They will be believing *and* unbelieving in regard to you, even as they have been in regard to Me"—which, perceiving his difficulty, he defends thus: "The subject of both clauses is *men* generally, not the world; hence, designedly, the Plural." But how came that to be the case just this

Hosted by Google

the literal phraseology must be violently forced if we would evade the ironical sense, a too sensitive opposition to which is the cause of much of the error here. This keen irony and nothing else is the undeniable meaning of the striking words, which by εἰ ἐτήρησαν speak of something that had *not* taken place as if it had.[1] The consolatory reference to an acceptance for their words, at least among some, has no place, according to our feeling, in this verse, nor generally in the whole discourse from ver. 18 to ver. 25. Ver. 21 obviously goes on with ταῦτα πάντα concerning persecution alone. The words deal exclusively with the *world*, not with the believers in the midst of it; they, rather, are already reckoned with the disciples themselves. Thus Grotius correctly: "If they have heard Me, ye may expect that they will hear you. *As if He should say, There is no ground to expect it.*" (Hirschb. Bibel: As little as they have received My word, so little, etc.) And Lampe: "There is a sorrowful meaning in the words." And he afterwards assents to those qui censent ironicum subesse sensum, quasi dixerit: "*As miserably as* they have kept My word, will they keep yours!"

This view will perfectly justify itself as the only correct one, when we finally consider how and for what purpose the *word* is here introduced. We may say at once that as the discourse is of standing and testifying against the world (ch. vii. 7), first in the Lord's own case, and then in theirs, *person* and *word* must come in juxtaposition. The person is persecuted; their word is —received and kept? See in what a manner they have received it already! Comp. the intimation of 1 Jno. iv. 5: they *speak of* the world and the world heareth them. But we speak the truth, which is of God; and *that* is the real cause of their enmity —in order that they may not be constrained to accept the word,

once? Von Gerlach: "Most had persecuted Him, yet some few had kept His word. *In the same relation*, and in no other, were they to hope for success!" That would be ὅσοι, ὅσῳ or ἐφ' ὅσον but not εἰ. Fikenscher still more recklessly: "Jesus had found true followers, and the servants of the Lord should never bear witness to His grace in vain." Braune, finally, entirely agrees with Lücke.

[1] Luthardt's protest against the irony is scarcely justified by his flat *hypothetical* view: "The disciples were to answer for themselves, which of these two cases would hold good here!" We are obstinate enough to find even in this no other than an ironical tone.

Hosted by Google

they persecute the person. Tholuck: "The ungodly minded man might probably, seeing that he cannot altogether suppress the conviction that the thorough Christian is a noble exhibition, let him alone or even give him his commendation, if he would only talk of his Christianity as something individually his own, and as it were a natural gift." Ah, but the testimony—Ye are the world, the grace of Christ hath saved me from it, save ye yourselves from this untoward generation!—As the Lord uses the words τὸν ὑμέτερον λόγον, He seems to say these two things: Let not their hatred cause you to keep back this word; but, also, Oppose the world with your word *alone*, do nothing more, for the rest suffer patiently, as I have suffered, all that may be done unto you?[1]

Ver. 21. Now comes the explanation by a second διὰ τοῦτο, which now first properly penetrates to the true ground of the whole. Him, the Son of the Father, abiding, living in eternal love, who would make all sinners His friends—Him, the great Helper and Saviour—to hate and to persecute, and carry on their increasing persecution upon His followers too! Whence and wherefore is this? The answer is, For *His* name's sake *we* are persecuted;—but He also first, because they know not His Father who sent Him, that is, they will not know Him, they hate Him in their inexcusable *sin*. But this sin is practical, persevering, opposing *unbelief*, which only in the abyss finds its true cause or causelessness. This is the connection and the substance of the whole down to ver 25. The ἀλλά gives so far *the reason*, as it takes away the ground of their astonishment, and by a disclosure of the true principle of the world's hatred, *consoles* their minds. He had elsewhere testified to them, Matt. x. 22, xxiv. 9 (comp. Matt. v. 11, ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ) that His disciples, for His name's sake, because He inwardly and essentially lives in them, and by their external testimony is avowed by them, should be persecuted; so is it here in vers. 18–20, and therefore ver. 21 does not any longer lay the emphasis upon that, but upon the declaration ὅτι οὐκ οἴδασι. Thus the ἀλλὰ is not spoken, as it were, because the disciples might have thought that for

[1] Hiller: "Here is no room for Elias' fire; for if the Lord has patience, what is His servant's duty?"

Hosted by Google

their own sakes all this would befall them.[1] Church history, from the earliest persecutions down to the present time, furnishes proof that the confession of the name of Jesus, yea this hated *name* itself, has always been the exciting cause of hatred. It holds good now as formerly—Apud Christianos nomen damnatur, non crimen.

Ταῦτα πάντα connects itself—in proof, too, that in the accompanying clause nothing else was predicted—only with the *διώκειν*, as the *ποιεῖν τινι* (or if Lachmann's reading, *εἰς ὑμᾶς*, be genuine, the *ποιεῖν εἰς*—) manifestly proves. But the enlarged *ταῦτα* contains the presupposal or declaration that the *διώκειν* will include or bring with it many individual acts of evil; see afterwards ch. xvi. 2, 3. *Οὐκ οἴδασι* stands absolutely, without doubt; and not simply as meaning that they do not acknowledge God in the particular character of the Sender of Jesus. See on ch. v. 37, vii. 28, viii. 19, 54, 55. They say, indeed, that He is their God, but they know Him not. This God hath *sent* Jesus, that is, into the world that the world might be saved, consequently also *to them;* but this they know and acknowledge not, because they will not *believe* Him. This is included as the undertone; but for the first the not knowing is specifically brought forward, in order in the *following* verse to press it further: "Ignorance would be otherwise an excuse"—but *here* it is in the fullest sense *inexcusable.*[2]

Ver. 22. Before all things we must seek the pregnant meaning of *ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἶχον* in ch. ix. 41, and refer to what was there said. Sin enough they have, forsooth; but all their sin, from their original depravity through all their opposition to God's commands and unbelief in His promise, their lie and hypocrisy, and all the evil deeds in which they were entangled,

[1] *We* may, indeed, make another application of the isolated saying: This hatred does not touch you and your various failings, but the name of the Lord!

[2] The *οὐ γὰρ οἴδασι τί ποιοῦσι*, spoken from the cross, has quite a different and milder meaning. Hence Dietz introduces the thought into our present text erroneously, when he says, "The world could *dare* to persecute the name of Jesus only because Jesus is not to it the Son of God." For the not knowing *here* is at the same time a well knowing, a not willing to know in spite of all conviction, and *therefore* a hating. As is undeniably proved by ver. 23.

Hosted by Google

would have been forgiven and taken away through Christ, if they had received Him in faith. Luther's marginal note goes at first not far enough: "Through Christ original sin is taken away, and since His coming condemns none but those who will not let it be taken away, that is, who will not believe." (Only afterwards in this "not letting" he corrects himself by including all actual sin.) That the only remaining, imputed *sin*, of which Christ speaks,[1] is no other than *unbelief*, appears through the whole of St John's Gospel, and in the connection of these last discourses especially (see our analysis), as it is decisively confirmed by ch. xvi. 9. De Wette strangely thinks that this takes away all meaning from the clause;—but this is its meaning, and it cannot be enough pondered that after the ἦλθον and ἐλάλησα of Christ all the sins of unbelieving sinners are concentrated into, confirmed and consummated by this unbelief alone. The sentence does not, indeed (and this we remark against Alford), make the idle assertion, If I had not come they would not have fallen into the sin of unbelief; but, Unbelief would not have become their last, complete, and ruining *sin*. For it is obvious of itself that in the condemnation of unbelief, all former sin is included as unforgiven. And here we may, once more, draw our own conclusion, whether all the heathen, to whom Jesus has not come and to whom He has not spoken, can be condemned, when even Israel falls into judgment not before, and only because, they had heard and seen the works and words of Jesus in vain! (Comp. Matt. xi. 21–24.) It is plainly enough to be observed, how the Lord here places Himself by a great distinction above all other messengers speaking from God who had come before Him; as also that, while all previous persecution and opposition might have been forgiven, the rejection of Himself alone definitively precluded all salvation.

In the ἦλθον the entire public, witnessing, and working manifestation of the Lord is embraced, and placed first: in the ἐλάλησα is embraced, with like comprehensiveness, primarily the testifying word, as "belonging to the full idea of the *coming*;"—as previously in ver. 20. Not, with Luther, And had

[1] In Nonnus: ἀλιτροσύνη νεμεσήμων, blasphemy meeting its appropriate vengeance.

Hosted by Google

told them this—although the meaning comes almost to the same. For, *spoken to them*[1] means: All that was to be discoursed and spoken to them, withholding nothing of the whole counsel of God, pointing out to them their sins and the way of their salvation. Not every one, indeed, in every corner of the land fell under this condemnation, if without fault of his the Lord had not come to him, and uttered His words in his hearing; but, on the other hand, there were many of whom it might be said, they *might* and they *ought* to have heard Him;—all sincere consciences would have felt, "Let us hear Him first."

But now they can bring nothing forward to excuse their sin: we would hold to this translation of Luther [vorwenden], as also the Berlenb. Bible, Bengel, Stolz, and de Wette, who retain "pretence," while other modern translators place instead "excuse," or "excuse themselves." We should expect, after the analogy of Rom. i. 20, the denial of a grounded, valid excuse; hence the Vulg. excusationem (which Erasmus changes to: quod prætexant), while Theophyl. explains *πρόφασις* by *ἀπολογία*. Klee also thinks that the word can signify only a *sound* apology. How does it then stand? Certainly *πρόφασις* means fundamentally only *prætextus*, *obtentus*, an *evasion*, that which only *says* to conceal or defend something thereby—a sense which the verb *προφασίζομαι* retains. Stephanus pointed out, and Lampe quotes him for the general *ἀπολογία*, that the expression generally was used as a juridical term bono maloque sensu promiscue; but in the legal domain this might have been a catachrestical transition of the meaning, and in that way the passages in Eurip. might be explained. And there are not wanting other decisive passages—not merely where the word passes over into the idea of "occasion, circumstance causing, reason"[2] (Hesych. *αἰτία*, Syr. in our passage עִלְּתָא), but where the truth of the *πρόφασις* is expressly acknowledged, as Demosth. xviii. 156, *τὴν μὲν ἀληθῆ πρόφασιν*, Thucyd. i. 23, *ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις*. But we maintain, nevertheless, that in the New Testament the latter unusual signification can scarcely be assumed, and that St John has used *πρόφασις* in its common and rigorous meaning. Compare the body of passages in the New Testament,

[1] Only not, with Pfenninger: persuaded them!

[2] Mediated by, "what could be stated about it."

Hosted by Google

e.g., especially Acts xxvii. 30, and the very plain antithesis in Phil. i. 18, εἴτε προφάσει εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ. Schöttgen (ed Spohn) would pave the way for *excusatio* in John xv. 22, by a reference to the more general *causa, ratio*, in 1 Thess. ii. 5, where ἐν προφάσει is taken, as parallel with ἐν λόγῳ, for a mere paraphrase of the substantive connected with it: so also Koppe and Rosenmüller. But almost all other expositors adhere here also to *prætextus*, as Bengel, see on this subject Olshausen.[1] We regard Matt. xxiii. 14 as the true parallel. Thus the New Testament uses πρόφασις only for *pretext*, as Wahl admits, placing this passage at the head. And in this word of our Lord there lies a subtile and important thought, which *for Israel* overpasses that εἶναι ἀναπολογήτους of the heathen. Israel, the clearer the testimony which it ever has (not merely in the conscience) against its sin, seeks in its pharisaical degeneracy pretexts to oppose that testimony; it is, as it were, the people of πρόφασις in the largest sense. Our law and our God, their honour—this is what they hold up now against the Lord, to conceal their hatred to the truth and love revealed in Him. But the Lord now says, as emphatically as truly, that this pretext (before God, and man, and their own conscience) is also taken away: no more can they with any authority and reason defend themselves by any pretended plea, still less can they vindicate or excuse themselves. The πρόφασις falls away, the ἁμαρτία of μισεῖν τὸν θεόν is disclosed! That, moreover, in the crucifixion of Christ the hypocritical arbitrary pretext first takes its culminating form; as, also, that in many individuals, who in various degrees of good conscience are opposed to Him, like Saul, some answer to the great question put to Israel, τί με διώκεις;[2] might be admitted as actual ἀπολογία and αἰτία—is by no means denied by our Lord's words. For the νῦν δέ, of which the Lord speaks, is proleptical; its fulfilment begins in the testimony of the Spirit, which glorifies all the words and works of Jesus to faith, but opposes them to unbelief (ch. xvi.

[1] Luther's indistinct translation is now corrected—with dissembled covetousness. Berlenb. with pretext of covetousness. De Wette: covetous hypocrisy.

[2] Mark, however, the quite general sense of this expression as used to Saul!

Hosted by Google

9), and has been ever since going on in Israel, as in the Christendom which resembles it.

Ver. 23. This is one more of the many consequences which result from the unity of the Father and the Son—the most lamentable of them all! He that seeth Me, seeth—he that believeth in Me, believeth in—he that loveth Me, loveth—he that *hateth* Me, hateth—*the Father!* See also Lu. x. 16, previously. He that *can* hate Jesus, the manifestation of God in the flesh, must bear in himself hatred to God—how else could that be possible? Thus it is not so much the consequence drawn, as an inference back to the true principle underlying the πρόφασις.[1] Just so he that hateth the disciples of the Lord, only confirms and declares his hatred to the Lord Himself. The Jews did hate God *before*, for as faith begets love, so unbelief bears hatred; but now they also hate Him as the Father and Sender of Jesus Christ. The order of our Lord's thought here coincides specifically with that of Ps. lxix. afterwards quoted, a psalm which predicts the judgment of Israel's hardening and rejection: See there, ver. 10, חֶרְפּוֹת חוֹרְפֶיךָ נָפְלוּ עָלָי. As the Lord was zealous for the honour of God in Israel, all the scorn and blasphemy with which Israel contradicted their God falls as suffering upon *His* head. (Rom. xv. 3.) That all this destiny was not accomplished once for all in Israel, but as the type and beginning of the future hatred of the *world* to the disciples of Jesus down to the end of the world,—has been made plain by the spirit of the discourse since ver. 18, and is now brought to remembrance by the general formula ὁ ἐμὲ μισῶν. Is it not so? "To the world the personality of God is itself a dismal idea"—says Fikenscher here. That is, His living holy personality; not the imagined delusion of a God which they call "their God," and even (as ch. viii. 41 exhibits to them) without and against Christ, although only from His words, "their Father"—just as the modern Jews. If, nevertheless, the living per-

[1] This is plainly what Luthardt means: "As they hate Christ, they hate God; therein was the greatness of their sin to be seen." How then can he contradict me afterwards, "*Not* because they hate God, hate they Christ." (Stier)? Would that the worthy writer read more carefully! What could be plainer than "not so much the consequence drawn, as the inference back?"

Hosted by Google

sonal God appears before them in the *πρόσωπον* of the Son, humbling Himself to them, and effectually witnessing to them His truth, then is the hatred of the haters only made manifest.

Ver. 24. To the previous *λαλεῖν*, which had already been referred to as conclusive for the condemnation of unbelief, the *ἔργα* are now added, quite in the sense and spirit of ch. v. 36, x. 37. Not that ver. 22 is in any way retracted, as having said too much: for even there the *ἦλθον* of our Lord's entire personality included also the works, and here the works are *not simply* the miracles. Thus what now follows, is, properly speaking, only a confirmation of what had before been said, exhibiting more clearly its reason, and more sharply defining its character. We must not undervalue the strength of the evidence of miracles, against our Lord's plain utterance; but we must understand His words, as we have abundantly shown already, that the strength and significance of these special *ἔργα* must be closely connected with His holy life and His true words. Augustin incorrectly understood *ἐν αὐτοῖς* to mean *in them;* and further interpreted (followed, too, by Thomas Aquinas) *in eorum corporibus*, a restriction to His healing beneficence which is here altogether out of place. *Ἐν αὐτοῖς* must rather be completed by *ὤν*, as in ch. xii. 35, comp. ver. 37, *ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν*. (Syr. has here לעניהון, before their eyes: Nonn. *αὐτῶν δερκομένων ὅτε μάρτυρες ἦσαν ὀπωπαί.*) Hence again, Acts ii. 22, *ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν*. Such works as *none other* had done:[1] they themselves admitted this, ch. vii. 31, ix. 32. Not only so *many* (ch. x. 32) but so *great*,[2] and further, so entirely *benevolent:* never any miracles of punishment, as in the case of former workers of miracles; altogether in harmony with His entire life, such as never before had been exhibited in sinful man. Hence it is needless and perverting to refer the *no other* to false prophets who had done *nothing* of this kind; this would be here a very strange thought. The twice redoubled *καί* has a great emphasis in the defining of all their *ἁμαρτία*; but on that very

[1] The question between *πεποίηκεν* and *ἐποίησεν* makes no difference, though the latter would more strictly suit the past.

[2] Lampe: Nodum in scirpo quærunt Augustinus et Beda, putantes non posse proprie dici, quod Jesus majora Mose et Prophetis fecerit, sed solum quod plura.

Hosted by Google

account it is not to be taken each time in precisely the same sense. *Καὶ ἐμὲ καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου* is explained by ver. 23 to mean—not merely Me, but in that also—*like* Me, the Father. On the other hand, in the first *καὶ ἑωράκασι καὶ μεμισήκασι* there lies, on account of the positive and strong *μεμισήκασι*, something more than in the similar formula, ch. vi. 36, where the translation is no more than, Although—nevertheless. Here the contrast is carried to its extreme point—My works, *Me* (and the Father) in them—*to see* and yet *to hate;*[1] these two irreconcilables are reconciled by a God-hating world! (as Lücke has well expressed it.)

Ver. 25. Once more an *ἀλλὰ*, which, like the former in ver. 21, obviates offence, and answers the objection—How is this possible, and permitted by God? The last *solace for* the fearful, actual hatred to Christ which the God-hating world exhibits (and which first fully manifested itself in Israel) lies in the counsel of the Divine wisdom which foretold all this, as the Scripture declares. At the same time is included: So little do they effect by their hatred and persecution, that they rather only fulfil the Scripture, while they themselves must draw upon themselves the judgments written in that Scripture.

The citation, which is introduced by the frequent recitative *ὅτι*, and unhesitatingly changes for the present occasion the *οἱ μισοῦντές με* into *ἐμίσησάν με*, may be sought for in Ps. lxix. 4, or xxxv. 19. We have shown that we prefer a direct reference to Ps. lxix.; for this is a Psalm which is elsewhere frequently interpreted in a Messianic sense (Jno. ii. 17; Rom. xv. 3, xi. 9, 10; Acts i. 20), and has other uninterpreted references to Christ, of which we will mention only vers. 9 and 22. *Δωρεάν*, as the LXX. used it in this *λόγος*, means *not* "without *result*" (as Bengel has: *in vain*); but simply—*without cause*. This is absolutely true only in the sacred Son of God, who hath nothing in Him which could provoke hatred; if His types or successors can appropriate the same complaint, it can be only *in as far* as they are in Him.

In Ps. lxix. 5, as in xxxv. 19, this sense of חִנָּם is explained by the parallel אוֹיְבַי שֶׁקֶר, *ἀδίκως*, as also by the frequent recurrence of the same or a similar expression. The sixty-ninth Psalm

[1] Not, They have seen *it* or *them*, but *ἑωράκασι* belongs to *καὶ ἐμὲ κ.τ.λ.*

Hosted by Google

certainly belongs to those which prophesy less directly than typically of Christ; for we must make this distinction, although the most direct prophecy has something typical in it, and the transition generally is very undefined. Compare closely the strictly related Ps. xxxv. (see especially vers. 11, 12, 17), which also *might* have been quoted in the New Testament.[1] It is obvious that we must think of this Psalm, too, in our passage; and we think that, with many others, it is included in the reference, though Ps. lxix. is pre-eminently applicable. The mere typical nature of this prophecy to be fulfilled, is indicated by ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος, not merely τὸ γεγραμμένον. We would not, with Surenhusen, by any means take it for the allegationis formula מה שנאמר, quæ adhibere solebat quando ad rem subobscure indicatam alludebatur (for Ps. lxix. at least speaks in almost the plainest terms of the Messiah)—but, on account of the γεγραμμένος added, would assign to the λόγος the same specific meaning as in ver. 20, that of a recurring sentence, a proverbial word. Compare, besides Ps. lxix. 5 and xxxv. 19, also Ps. xxxviii. 20, cix. 3, cxix. 78, 86, as also Ps. vii. 5, xxv. 3 (רֵיקָם temere, sine causâ).[2] The added ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν, further, has here an intense meaning, just as in chap. x. 34, we found in it more than mere νόμος instead of γραφή. Bengel: in lege eorum, quam assidue terunt et jactant.[3] But even this is not enough, while the "*bitter* irony" of de Wette—"they truly follow, indeed, what is in their law!"—is, on the other hand, too much. This would be too bitter here where the πρόφασιν οὐκ ἔχουσι gives us the fundamental thought and feeling of our Lord—Their hatred and unbelief are *inexcusable*, no longer to be *disguised* or *palliated!* Therefore, though the *undertone* of νόμος αὐτῶν may possibly be—On which they rely (against Me), thus indicating the πρόφασις they alleged; yet we cannot but think the *fundamental idea* to be that their law *testified against them*, that their Scripture, which gives the right utterance upon

[1] As we have observed in our Psalmenkommentar.

[2] But שִׂנְאַת חִנָּם Ps. xxv. 19 is something different.

[3] Similarly Surenhusius: Vox αὐτῶν hic exprobrandi vim habet, *quasi cum iracundiâ quâdam*, ac si dixisset Jesus, *non miror* quod Judæi me gratis odio habebant, cum hoc jam diu dictum sit in lege ipsorum, in qua usque adeo gloriari solent, quod *ipsorum* lex sit.

Hosted by Google

everything, already most convictingly called their sin *by its right name*. This would be strictly parallel with Rom. iii. 19. All Scripture becomes a condemning law against Israel, because they have not believed and attained unto its promise. In this fearful μισεῖν δωρεάν reveals itself the satanic *groundlessness* of their sin, its nature as coming from the abyss; as hatred of God it has no further valid reason. For here it may be said, "In sin there is neither reason nor righteousness." (Berlenb. Bible.) It is remarkable that even the blind Talmudists were constrained to observe something peculiar in the שִׂנְאַת חִנָּם—while they do not acknowledge this guilt to have been consummated upon the Messiah who had come, they do regard it as in itself the heaviest guilt, and the true cause of their last long exile.[1]

THE TESTIMONY OF THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH AGAINST THE WORLD: PREDICTION TO OBVIATE OFFENCE.

(Ch. xv. 26–xvi. 4.)

All that has been said since ver. 18 was intended by our Lord to *console* His disciples beforehand in prospect of their oppression through the world's hatred; but this plain fore-anouncement, that nothing else awaited them, must at first have all the more terrified their already saddened hearts. He, therefore, goes back to the original *promise* which pervades all these discourses, that the Comforter and Helper would come. It was presupposed in vers. 20, 21, that the disciples would be hated like Himself, on account of their *word* which would confess *the name of the Lord*. He predicted this fate to them as His *witnesses*. It was obvious that they should think, But how shall we poor weak men persist in our testimony, yea, even begin it, in the face of such predicted hatred? and He confirms to them their vocation, and predicts to them with equal clearness that they

[1] In the Talm. hier. tract. Joma we find the question—Wherefore was the second temple, which certainly some righteous men served, laid waste? And the answer is, בְּסִבַּת שִׂנְאַת חִנָּם. For hatred without cause is worse than idolatry or blood-guiltiness.

Hosted by Google

should bear His testimony in the future. Not of themselves, however, and in their own human persons: the Paraclete will conduct the cause. He then, however, returns to the former again, and consoles them by the emphatic assurance,—That ye might not stumble at this, I have now (more clearly than ever before) *foretold to you* both the coming of the Spirit as a Witness against the hatred of the world, and at the same time the continuance of that hatred in spite of His testimony.

Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ refers back to the already given promise, which is presupposed; here the all-embracing comforting name παράκλητος, and then the other, which as in chap. xiv. 16, 17, makes prominent a specific character—πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας.[1] The distinction and the new element in this saying lie first (as we remarked before) in the change of the expression—I will send Him unto you from the Father (in chap. xiv. 16, 26, the Father will give Him at My request, send Him in My name); and then in the peculiarity of the definition, which hints at a deep meaning and significance in the thought—ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται. If we take first the superficial connection of the most general meaning, we see plainly that after the Lord has mentioned the already known official name of the coming Person (co-ordinate with the Father and Himself), He goes on to apply, for the special consolation of His disciples, *two predicates of dignity* to this mighty Witness, unconquerable by the hating world. He is the Spirit of *truth* who yields to no lie and contradiction—and He comes *out from God*, yea (as we might at once view it) right immediately from the Father, out of His essence; consequently "His Divine power will be irresistible."[2]

The interpretation of Grotius, which would resolve the first παρὰ τοῦ πατρός with πέμψω into the more indefinite ex domo patris, ex cœlo, is certainly wrong; for ἐγώ and πατρός are the complement one of the other, and the same thing is said conversely which the former promise said—that in the Spirit's coming and being sent the Father and the Son are alike the source and cause. The ἐκπορεύεται afterwards certainly opens a deeper

[1] The *opposition* (just as there) belongs here to παράκλητος, not to ὅν—thus the Vulg. *spiritum* is wrong.

[2] As von Gerlach well expresses this first connecting thought.

Hosted by Google

ground (as Grot. himself admits) for the παρὰ τοῦ πατρός. This word, here alone used concerning the Holy Spirit (parallel with the ἐξέρχεσθαι of the Son) is assuredly something different from πέμπεται—for the Lord does not speak with rhetorical tautology, but in a well-weighed progression of language and thought. Luther's view, "Who both proceeded from the *Father* and is sent by *Christ*"—would give a very tame repetition of the ἐγὼ παρὰ τοῦ πατρός. The *present* which now follows the πέμψω, especially as accompanying πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, manifestly is intended more closely to define and characterise the nature of this Spirit. It does not help us to take the ἐκπορεύεσθαι as a *figurative* expression—like a flowing water, or a stream proceeding from its fountain: this Olshausen does (after Chrysostom's Homily on the Holy Ghost), referring to the passages which speak of the Spirit as poured out or flowing forth. For, not to mention that *here*, where τὸ πνεῦμα is interposed between the personal designations παράκλητος and ἐκεῖνος, a figurative allusion is scarcely probable, the figure itself must presuppose a corresponding nature, and this would have to be further inquired into. Grotius translates with perfect propriety, de patris ipsius *substantiâ* procedit. Let all this be refuted by those who can refute it; the living impression of this striking word upon myself obliges me to maintain that we cannot limit it to a so-called *economical* procession or derivation of the Spirit from the Father; for that would be no other than the mere parallel πέμπεσθαι already rejected. The πέμπεσθαι belongs to the παράκλητος, to the πνεῦμα the ἐκπορεύεσθαι. Here, rather, by the side of and after the economical relation, the essential relation is also designedly defined; even as this discloses itself in that, and is the foundation of it. Although Lampe (whose weak reasons we are not now disposed to answer) at large, and Lücke with a peremptory sentence, denies this—the ἐκπορεύεσθαι is assuredly, like everything similar in St John concerning the relation between the Father and the Son, to be taken *metaphysically*.[1]

[1] This we hold still against Hofmann (Schriftbeweis i. 177), who would, with an arbitrary restriction, read, "The Spirit proceedeth from the Father, *when* Jesus sendeth Him"—as also against Luthardt, who follows him, and takes this word in its simple "historical" meaning. What can be the motive for taking all metaphysical statements away from Scripture,

Hosted by Google

But nothing beyond this would we now maintain, nor enter into the old and rather unwise contention concerning the *filioque*. Such questions must be fundamentally and comprehensively considered: otherwise, they should be modestly omitted.[1] The germs of the contention which divided the churches of the East and West were easily found in Trinitarian speculation. While the Greeks sought to establish the Unity in Trinity by referring all things back to the Father as the ἀρχή, they were disposed to limit the procession of the Holy Ghost to the Father alone; this suited the view which came at last to think of and define the Father as *working* (causa efficiens), the Son as *mediating*. Hence the formula, The Spirit proceedeth *from* the Father *through* the Son,—for there is only μία ἀρχὴ—τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑφίσταται. (Basil.)[2] In the West, on the other hand, the ὁμοούσιον, as opposed to all subordination, required as its consequence that the Spirit should proceed from the Son as well as the Father. Augustin, more profoundly and comprehensively thinking on the Trinity, could nevertheless not refrain from allowing a *principaliter de Patre* (de Trin. xv. 12). Indeed Theodoret (against Cyril's Anathemas) repudiates altogether the saying that the Spirit has His existence from the Son or through the Son—appealing to Jno. xv. 26 and 1 Cor. ii. 12. All this properly belongs to the defence against Arian notions; and so intended, it is right. But what is the result of an unprejudiced speculation upon the dogma, of an investigation of the analogy of Scripture upon it, and of a calm consideration of this locus classicus in St John? The opposition to the *filioque* must be pronounced unfounded, in spite of some specious arguments on the other side, because the fundamental position cannot be broken,—that everything which the Father doeth and hath (save that He is the Father and begetteth the Son) is at once also appropriated to the Son. The Spirit is at the same time the unity of the Father and the Son. It would be an unsound subordination of

in opposition to the "ancient church" and the sanctified speculation of all ages?

[1] But we must partly agree with Thiersch (Kathol. u. Prot. ii. Aufl. 1. 228) that the profounder differences of this Trinitarian speculation cannot be decided from Scripture alone.

[2] Just as John Damasc. in the ἔκδοσις ἀκριβής.

Hosted by Google

the Son in the Holy Trinity, if the Spirit were not regarded as also of *His* essence. According to Rom. viii. 9; Gal. iv. 6; Phil. i. 19; 1 Pet. i. 11, the Spirit is wholly and entirely, even before the incarnation and glorification of the Son, *the Spirit of this Son*. In Rev. xxii. 1 (which has been compared) the stream of living water proceedeth from the throne of God *and of the Lamb*. Does the Lord then here (Jno. xv. 26) speak *exclusively* in παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, or not, rather, *complementarily*, admitting therewith and presupposing a παρὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ. We think the latter only. "Not alone from the Father is the *proceeding forth* of the Spirit, but also from the Son: not alone from the Son is the sending of the Holy Spirit, but also from the Father." Thus does Klee, with excellent discrimination, point out the sense of this passage. As, supplying the lack of ch. xiv. 26, He has assumed for Himself the ἐγὼ πέμψω, He must now in order to guard on all sides the equal dignity of the holy Three-One, *not only* give the Father His right by the first παρὰ τοῦ πατρός which He therefore appends, but also, *in order to obviate all appearance of an exclusive subordination of the Spirit under Himself, the Son*, and to indicate the Spirit as of like Divine nature with the Son who *came forth from the Father* (ch. xvi. 28), expressly utter the ἐκπορεύεσθαι παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς which advances from the economical to the essential relation. This alone is the reason and the meaning of this utterance.[1] Here as the Son of man He has on His own part occasion to speak only of a πέμπειν. When, after His glorification, "the Spirit proceedeth from Him *in a new manner*," that is, mediated by His corporeity, it is not denied thereby, rather *presupposed* (Jno. xvii. 5) that the Spirit essentially proceedeth from the eternal Son, as from the Father. The determined opposition to the consistent *filioque*—which we would not regard, with Marheineke, as a *mera pertinacia*—can be treated with respect only when viewed as a fruit of narrow conscientiousness, determined to speak literally only in the letter of Scripture.

For the rest, in all dogmatic statement concerning the pro-

[1] In the same sense as in the confirmation of the Nicene Symbol. in the second council of Constant., the Spirit is named—τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιοῦν, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ.

Hosted by Google

cession of the Spirit in the interior of Deity, we hold generally with Lampe: "Which mystery, as it is past explication, is to be profoundly adored; and, in the silence of Scripture, we are not willing to obscure, and perchance to dishonour, it by scholastic terms of definition." As also with the well-known words of Melanchthon (Loc. Com.): "We do better to adore, than to investigate, the mysteries of the Godhead.—The Most High God hath clothed His Son in flesh, that He might lead us away from the contemplation of His majesty to the contemplation of our own flesh, and so of our own weakness." This is the cause why the dogmatics thus inaugurated were so practical.

Ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ—this is even here the main point to which our Lord directs attention. Had not the Scripture long ago borne witness of Him, and similarly the Father in the works? And the Son also of Himself? Quite true, and yet when the Spirit so comes as He had never before been in the world, there begins a consummate, final, and so far quite new testimony, which seals and glorifies all others. The Spirit shows us the Son and His works in a new and clear light; He opens the ancient Scripture; He even creates a new Scripture which was wanting to the Old as its consummation. "He will testify *of Me*"—mark here, as we rightly said upon ch. xiv., that this παράκλητος carries on the interest of God, that is, of Christ with us (with the disciples and the world) primarily as the present Representative, who speaketh for the departed Lord (Grotius: actor caussæ *suæ*). While He thus previously testifies of Christ to the disciples themselves, and then *through* them to the world, He becomes at the same time a Counsellor, Helper, Intercessor, Representative, *for* the disciples.

Ver. 27. *How* will He then testify, and *what?* The answer to this question now follows: He will not immediately (by any personal manifestation as the Son) bear witness, but in and through you: further, He will testify that which ye have already seen in Me, that which ye have already heard of Me —nothing besides, essentially different or new. By this we have the way paved for an answer to a question which has been so hard and misleading to many, Whether the Lord here lays down a *distinction* between the two testimonies, that of the Spirit and that of the disciples, and what is the nature of that

Hosted by Google

difference? Assuredly there is, in the first place, *no* distinction, in as far as the preceding ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει actually embraces, of itself and as standing first, the whole testimony. The καὶ ὑμεῖς appears plainly to be based upon that, following first when He had fully come. The disciples were directed to wait for this, see Lu. xxiv. 49; Acts i. 8; and comp. John xx. 21, 22. Hence B.-Crusius (whose commentary as it proceeds becomes more and more rationalistic) says very incorrectly, "Here the higher and the mere human faculty of the disciples are distinguished, and placed *by the side of* each other!" O no, what their mere human power was χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, that is, without the Spirit who first fully united them with Him, we have seen in ver. 5. And what Euthymius with a good intention says is not careful and precise enough, ἐπάγει παραμυθίαν, λέγων ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον συνεργήσει αὐτοῖς. Nor is the distinction well-considered which many orthodox writers labour to establish, between the direct witness of the Spirit by His manifestation (the visible signs at the outpouring, the miracles, etc.), and the words of the Apostles. For signs and wonders are, again, as in regard to Christ so also in regard to the Spirit, no testimony in themselves, but become such in their confirmation of the word, Mark xvi. 20; Heb. ii. 3, 4. The disciples bear witness as the first recipients of the Spirit, who testifies in their persons, who speaks and offers Himself to others through their words. In μαρτυρεῖτε after μαρτυρήσει we are not to seek, with Bengel, an antithesis between the *present* and the future—for how far were the disciples at that time from testifying to the world! But Lücke is right, that this *present* expresses and confirms "their abiding vocation as witnesses," although that was not to be fully established until a time still in the future, though near. After the great *when* of the previous verse, the sense of this is plain —*Then shall ye* actually bear witness, who are now already fore-elected to that office. And more, then will your testimony be the testimony of the Spirit, who will make you infallible *in this vocation and function.*

This must be established in our minds, and never lost sight of, in respect to the unity of the testimony. We have nothing here of de Wette's "two distinct views lying at the foundation, the natural and supernatural!" Rightly understood, indeed,

Hosted by Google

the whole appended clause with καὶ ὑμεῖς does establish a distinction in the unity of the testimony; this is most decisively settled if the δέ (Erasm.: Quin et vos) is taken to be genuine, and, independently of that, by the final and plain words, Because ye have been with Me from the beginning. Does not this refer to the human-personal character of the Apostles especially, and does it not consequently assign to this a peculiar relation to the testimony? We should not indeed translate, with the Berl. Bible, "for *that* (your appointment to bear witness) is the reason why ye have been within Me from the beginning, and as such is now confirmed at the end"—yet the meaning extends as far as this. To the eleven it afterwards rightly appeared as the first requirement for an Apostle (though they knew nothing then of the compensation for the lack of it which the Spirit would supply in Paul) that he should have been with Jesus from the beginning—ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπτης καὶ ὑπηρέτης, Acts i. 21; Lu. i. 2 (which parallels explain the true meaning of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, just as in Jno. xvi. 4, vi. 64, ἐξ ἀρχῆς). See, further, in Acts x. 39–41, the emphasis laid upon eye-witness of the life and acts of Jesus before and after His death; as also in Acts v. 39 the same distinction as in our present passage—*We* are witnesses, *and* so is the Holy Ghost. When we have first established it firmly in our minds that the former could never have taken place without the Holy Ghost, not only that the fishermen and publicans could never have come forward as witnesses without a pentecost for *their own* hearts, but that also without the demonstration of the Spirit and of power all their human personal testimony would have effected nothing, converted no souls, established no churches—then we may turn to the more direct consideration of the special nature and meaning of their *human-personal* testimony.

The excellent Olshausen strangely misses his way when he says that the disciples are exhibited as especial witnesses for the Lord—"only inasmuch as they were those who were the constant attendants upon Christ, and had opportunity to mark the most subtile movements of His inner being (?), and yet could never impute to Him any sin." Was it then with them, as with the centurion under the cross, that they were convinced ὄντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν—and was that which no human eye-

Hosted by Google

witness could make absolutely certain to be made certain to the world by the word of venerating disciples? We prefer to think that the entire humanly manifested life and work of the Lord, so far as men might observe it and become actual witnesses for it, was committed to *historical evidence* through the records of the disciples (1 Jno. i. 2, 3)—and, on the other hand, that the conservation, attestation, communication, and diffusion of all the light and life of God which their history contains, was committed especially to the Spirit accompanying the word. Not a speculative idea after the notion of Baur,[1] but a historical fact, is the ground-work of the world's salvation; but God introduces the historical element historically into the world, as these plain Apostles who commend themselves to every man's conscience "as truth-loving men" *speak* simply and as men *that which they had seen and heard*, since they had been with Jesus. Thus their testimony as human persons, and as thus distinguished, refers especially to the human history of our Lord; but the same Spirit who made them capable of this by being their Remembrancer and Inspirer, infuses His own energy, which effects much more than a mere historical faith,[2] and further brings additional instruction and prophecy out of and upon the ground of the evangelical records. This distinction is therefore by no means the same which we express by the external, instrumental *word*, and the internally efficient *Spirit;* but where St Matthew and St John in their Gospels, and St Peter in his Epistle (2 Pet. i. 16–18) *relate*, each speaks precisely in the sense of our Lord's word which we are now considering—I am His witness (John xix. 35, xxi. 24)—where, however, St John in his Prologue, or St Paul in his Epistles, speaks something beyond that, there the Holy Ghost bears His own specific witness through them. *St Paul* assuredly is by this not "excluded from among the witnesses of our Lord" (as Münchmeyer strangely deduces from my ex-

[1] Whose hallucinations are wrecked upon this passage, as upon this entire Gospel. Speculative ideas without historical reality are ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος, and of them the world had enough before Christ. But in the Gospel we have πεπληροφορημένα πράγματα, in St John as well as in St Luke.

[2] And even this, of course, the accompanying Spirit works. For to *this* history of the world, so long as it opposes the Spirit, refuses acceptance, in spite of *all other historical criticism:* hence, "The people think they have seen and heard it all, *but it is not yet true!*"

Hosted by Google

position)—but *his* testimony for the Lord is different from that of the eye-witnesses, and belongs only to that one first witness to which our Lord gives the first place in His saying. Here we are altogether at one with Lücke, whose words so appropriately meet the case, that we may quote them in full. "There were testimonies for Christ independently of immediate discipleship, as the testimony of St Paul. But the immediate testimony of the Spirit subsisted not without the historical testimony of Christ's body of disciples.[1] This latter was firmly established, even after the direct witnesses were removed, *in the writings* kept by the Church, as the permanent historical foundation for the former.[2] *To the absolute testimony of the Spirit* concerning Christ, which may be conceived as quite apart from the Apostles, is added the disciples' *historically to be preserved testimony*, that of the first witnesses." And if this last clause might appear one-sided (though it appears clearly enough included in καὶ ὑμεῖς δέ), Lücke supplements it out of our Lord's own word, which applies in both directions. "We have in ch. xvi. 8, etc., the corresponding opposite point of view, according to which the *glorifying testimony of the Spirit* (only not merely glorifying!) is brought forward in addition to the *historical testimony of the disciples*, even as it regards themselves."

We would now apply our exposition to the use of the preacher, who, according to Matt. xxviii. 20, should refer this text to all Christians, and not permit himself to limit it to the Apostles and first disciples. It must, however, be remarked that there is something in it which applies only to them. Assuredly, the Lord does speak for all futurity of the obligation and impulse of all true disciples to testify of Him in their vocation and sphere —not only those specially set apart, but every man who is His disciple and a professor of His name. He promises to us all the Spirit as One who shall bear witness in and through us all. But the special meaning of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστε no longer holds

[1] Hence St Paul's Epistles *presuppose* the essential and entire evangelical tradition. He who will not receive St Paul's words, must first give up the Gospels; again, he who does the latter must end in denying the genuineness of St Paul's Epistles.

[2] To this belongs the proemium of St Luke; but also *the testimony of the Spirit to the authentic tradition* down to our own day.

Hosted by Google

good of us; there can be only an *application* of it corresponding to our own relation. As, according to chap. xiv. 26, the Spirit brings to our remembrance also the words of Jesus heard before, although not immediately from His own lips—similarly do we testify, when the Spirit has come to us, as those who have been with the Master in an *internal* experience and guidance from the first commencement of His teaching. We first livingly experience and receive, through the New Testament Scriptures, the life, deeds, and sayings of our Lord, as eye and ear witnesses of the *second* degree; and in like manner we have added to us the first history of the Church and teaching of the Apostles. Then we also *wait* humbly for power from on high, *so far as* word and Spirit may be regarded in us as yet distinct (which, strictly speaking, is no longer necessary)—and only then, but assuredly then, it is our obligation and right to testify with power and success what *we* have seen and heard in historical conviction and living experience. And here much may be preached against the presumptuous and uncalled, who *think* that they must do and speak much *for* the name of Jesus, before He has rightly taught, and furnished, and sent them. How much confusion and injury has this wrought in the Church! Thou canst not truly and efficiently convince a child of the truth of a word in the catechism without the Spirit; but if the alone witnessing Spirit has come to thee, thou wilt and thou must give thy testimony before all the world. For He who once said, I receive not testimony from men—now makes men His witnesses to the end of the world and to the ends of the earth.

CHAP. XVI. Vers. 1, 2. *Ταῦτα* refers here not only to the prediction of the world's hatred, but also to the promise of the witnessing Spirit:—to both in their true connection. The former is paralleled by the latter, as an equivalent, and thus the disciples are defended from making it a stumbling-block to their hurt (see *σκανδαλίζεσθαι*, Matt. xiii. 21, xxiv. 9, 10). The then present disciples, although the Lord had often spoken to them of it, had never yet thought that their future *persecution* would be a great reality, that they must *suffer patiently;* they had always expected a very different kingdom, and a very different might and defence against the evil world than—the Spirit of testimony. Therefore the prediction is now decisively confirmed

Hosted by Google

—It will be actually so, but ye shall nevertheless continue your testimony: yea, then first shall ye begin rightly to bear witness. The ἀποσυναγώγους ποιεῖν began already in ch. ix. 22, xii. 42; and had been somewhat more darkly pre-intimated in Lu. vi. 22, *When they shall separate you, and cast forth your name as evil.* It shall befall the fruit-bearing branches that they shall—in external appearance, and as the exact reverse of the truth—be as if they were cut off and cast out as withered! And this not only shall the Jews do in the beginning, as their special act is here the foundation of the typical expression; but the members of the true church will be oftentimes cast out of the external church.[1] *And more:* it shall touch their life, as that of the Apostles and first Christians. For although it has been said that excommunication is an evil more sharp to the soul and more difficult to be overcome than all assaults upon the body and the life—yet that is not strictly true, and the Lord does not here so regard it. He who is strong and confident in the truth may suffer that truth to be called a lie without being much aggrieved; but, to our weakness, and our unsinful natural love of life, the death of martyrdom must ever be the crown of patience and endurance. Therefore the Lord advances, not merely heightening the enmity, but pointing out the still greater temptation to apostasy, by a stronger ἀλλά, which has the significance of *imo et, quin imo.* (To be explained by the ellipsis of οὐ μόνον before; Glassius, quandoque significationem βεβαιώσις habet. Comp., *e.g.*, Lu. xii. 7; Acts xix. 2; 1 Cor. iii. 2, iv. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 11; Phil. iii. 8.) So also the ἵνα after ἔρχεται ὥρα, as in ver. 32, equivalent to a ὅτι pointing to the future, not quite the same therefore with ὅτε—see on ch. xii. 23.

Not only, Ye shall be declared unworthy of, and unfit for, the service of God, and be cast out of the fellowship of λατρεύειν τῷ θεῷ—but it will be regarded by the perverted and perverting συναγωγή as itself a λατρεία, to kill you! In this transition, indicated by the ἀλλά, lies the true answer as to the meaning of this expression, which Luther has well caught—Will think that he doeth God a service therein. It has been asked whether

[1] Not to say, Members of the true church, of evangelical bodies professing the name of Christ alone and His salvation, will deny each other the communion

Hosted by Google

λατρεία (corresponding to the Heb. עֲבֹדָה, as λατρεύειν to עבד) must not be here in specie equivalent to *sacrifice*. The Peschito translated דְקוּרְבְּנָא מְקָרֵב; similarly the Pers. and Arab., Nonn. and Euthym.; and Lampe (although in translating he adopts the *cultum* of Erasm., instead of the too general *obsequium* of the Vulg.) maintains strongly that the προσφέρειν connected with it is decisive for *sacrificium*. And many follow him even now, bringing into comparison Rom. xii. 1; where, however, λατρεία in connection with θυσία, has only the more general idea, a *sacrificial offering*, only in as far as this already passes over into the *service of God*. This *might* be taken as the true meaning of our present passage; the view is very plausible, and, indeed, in this most special sense our Lord's words have sometimes had an actual fulfilment. We may compare περικάθαρμα, 1 Cor. iv. 13, which word the Sept. puts for כֹּפֶר, Prov. xxi. 18 (Aq., Sym., Theodot. ἐξίλασμα); and think of a similar notion as entertained by the heathen from the highest antiquity, and which recurred in the great Christian persecutions; as well as of Rabbinical sayings, which (probably based on Ex. xxxii. 29?) term the slaying of heretics a sacrifice;[1] and of the practice of the Roman Catholic Church.[2] Nevertheless, although this strongest meaning is included, and even intimated in προσφέρειν (inasmuch as all cultus is also a sacrificium), it seems to us too special to stand by itself in its interpretation of πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνας. This general word must include more, and refer also to those who, while they do not see in it a sin-offering and means of propitiating God, yet think it a work well-pleasing to God, a λατρεία.

O that unhappy *thinking*, into which the hatred of unbelief may be hardened and blinded, while it seeks to justify itself before God! As the Lord had in ἀποσυναγώγους taken His expression from blinded Israel, so He does still; yet He refers in the expression to the heathens likewise, and even to future Christians. We cannot say with Lampe at once that πᾶς

[1] Jalkut Schimeoni fol. 245, col. 3. num. 772, and Bammidbar rabbah fol. 229, col. 3, כל שופך דמן של רשעים באילו הקריב קרבן. Comp. on the slaying of Christians generally, Eisenmenger ii. S. 202-217.

[2] Hiller: Ye witnesses of the last time, know ye the city in which the slayer of a heretic has an eternal indulgence?

Hosted by Google

evidently includes the Gentiles also (for which the Sing. τῷ θεῷ does *not* suit), but the general reference lies still further back. The discourse had been hitherto always concerning the *world* generally, in which expression the disciples would be inclined to think first of the heathen world; but the Lord had instructed them more particularly to include in it all who stood in opposition to God, and even the Jews pre-eminently; and He now concludes most earnestly, *Also* from these who have hated and will slay Me, expect nothing better for yourselves! To which, further, the general thought underlying the whole may be added, And the Holy Ghost will not protect you *against* their hatred by any external power.

Ver. 3 returns to the principle already disclosed in ch. xv. 21. Even the true church should and must *cast out*, for the sake of truth and love; but it belongs to the false synagogue to treat those differing in faith with hatred which reaches unto persecution, and putting to death as λατρεία. The οὐκ ἔγνωσαν appears now, as it has been prepared for by δόξῃ, to have a more general and milder application than the wilful not knowing before mentioned; it is to be found in various degrees, even in the zeal, forgiven by *grace* and turned to its right object, of an unknowing Saul, who nevertheless literally acted according to vers. 1, 2. And, inasmuch as we cannot distinguish these degrees, it becomes us (as Lange says) "to deal very mercifully in our hearts with our enemies unto death"—to mourn over our blind persecutors, and, like Stephen, to continue the Lord's own intercession for those who know not what they do.

Ver. 4. The ἀλλά once more, as in ch. xv. 21, is intended to compose their minds, but with a specific meaning here—*They* know not, but I know all beforehand, and ye also should know what I have said to you concerning it. The ἐγώ before εἶπον has a deep though generally overlooked emphasis, which Beda (see in Lampe) exhibited in all its force. I have told you that ye shall suffer such things—the memoria personæ dicentis is here most impressive. I, who am the Truth, who go before unto death in love to you and the world, who have might enough to defend you, who will compensate your patience, strengthen you in your sufferings by My Spirit, save you from death, and take you to Myself! As long as I was with you

Hosted by Google

My presence was your defence, hatred made Me its object, the hour of persecutions for you was not yet come. Therefore did I not before *speak* thus unto you, although I *knew* all this from the beginning.

But now come forward the exegetes of all ages and remind us that in the Synoptic gospels the Lord had actually from the beginning said these things—Matt. v. 10–12, x. 21–28, xvi. 24, 25, xxiii. 34, xxiv. 9; Lu. vi. 22, etc. How are we to reconcile with all this the *I said not* of St John? Augustin would obviate all difficulty by referring *these things* to the promise of the *Paraclete*, but that does violence to the whole connection. So much is true in this (and it has been overlooked to the prejudice of a sound interpretation) that this last *ταῦτα*, as well as the first in ver. 1, does include the comforting promise in the whole discourse; but that the fore-announcement of persecution is primarily and chiefly meant is plain from the *ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἡ ὥρα* repeated from ver. 2, as well as from its immediate connection with *ταῦτα ποιήσουσιν*. The latter commentators resolve it in more or less plain terms thus, that the Synoptics did not strictly adhere to chronological exactness, but transposed Christ's later utterances into His earlier discourses;—not without some tokens of imagining, moreover, an *ex eventu*. Lampe dismissed all this with an *absurdissime*. Lücke further adds that "John followed in this his own pragmatism"—that is, that he passes by what the other Evangelists relate, because he has not also related it, and lets his Lord, therefore, thus speak here; but, as it regards the attempts to reconcile St John and the Synoptics, and to show that the Scripture need not be broken, he permits himself to pronounce his decree—"*all in vain!*" We shall find reason to pronounce our decree too, and say with the church of antiquity, *οὐδεμία γραφὴ τῇ ἑτέρᾳ ἐναντία ἐστί*.

Others, as Chrys., have contented themselves with assuming that the Lord had not so perfectly, at least, so strongly and plainly, declared from the beginning what He now says. Bengel: He had spoken of the hatred of the world, but *less openly, and more sparingly*. That there is a general truth in this cannot be denied by any one who compares St John's discourse here with the sayings of the Synoptics. B.-Crusius,

Hosted by Google

indeed, candidly admits this difference, but does injustice to the earlier sayings, and goes too far when he thinks that these "uttered only possibilities and in quite general terms." O no, they also speak of hating, scorning, casting out, even of slaying, plainly and directly enough. So far Lampe is right, "It is vainly said that Jesus had not so clearly and perspicuously predicted these sufferings. He who looks at the cited passages will find that they are by no means less clear than the passage before us." Admitting this, it is nevertheless true that our Lord might with good reason affirm that He had never hitherto thus uttered what He now says,[1] if we only take His meaning rightly, instead of adhering to the external mention simply of the impending evil. This is the superficial arbitrariness of Lücke, when he briefly dismisses with his "all in vain"—appealing to Bengel's remark, which he should have understood better—the train of thought which led Lampe in the right direction. In effect, the comprehensive substance of the present declaration, that which is new and peculiar in it, is the *caussarum* hujus odii a Judæis perferendi *specialior anatome*.[2] And might not the profound and concise Bengel have meant this by his *aperte?* That the world as world, because it will not know the Father and the Son, cannot do otherwise—where had He said that before? And we seek in vain in the earlier sayings, as Lampe remarks, for the declaration that they would do this *under the guise of religion and piety*. Adding to this that He had formerly spoken hints which were broken off, interposed among other things, or prophecies (as in Matt. x.), which on account of the distance of the time (before the hour was come), remained obscure most assuredly *to the disciples*, while now since ch. xv. 18, He speaks of it *ex instituto* as His farewell utterance—and is not all this of itself enough? But we cannot refrain from adding further, that as ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν, ver. 4, goes back to ver. 1, while this again depends upon

[1] To lay the emphasis of ἐξ ἀρχῆς thus—not *in* the beginning—as if it was ἐν ἀρχῇ, is not right, partly because *I was with you* embraces the whole of the past, and partly because it had been said in the beginning in the Sermon on the Mount.

[2] Yet we much reject Lampe's supposition, ventured on by *forte*, that ἐξ ἀρχῆς indicates this—ex fundamento seu ex origine.

Hosted by Google

ch. xv. 26, 27, the prediction of persecution (and this is the truth in Augustin's expedient), derives a new character from its connection with the promise of the Paraclete. Consequently, He had never said *these things* to them before—as so directly not to be misunderstood, as so definitely connected with the thought of doing God service, with such disclosure of the deepest ground of this hatred, and finally, as so closely bound up with the consolatory confirmation of the security of their future testimony through the Holy Ghost (compare the mere note of accord in Matt. x. 20). We may therefore confidently utter our *all to good purpose!* and go so far as to say conversely that we might have presumed a priori, from the characteristics of *the Lord's* method of teaching, that He would not in His wisdom and love have spoken suddenly and abruptly at the end what He now so sternly and rigorously and plainly says, but that He would rather have prepared them for it by some previous intimations. So that even now, at the threshold of the Spirit's illumination, the disciples might already bring to their own mind—Yes, this is that to which He has often pointed our thoughts! See this expressly, ch. xv. 20.

THE COMFORTER OBTAINED BY HIS DEPARTURE WILL CONVINCE THE WORLD, AND GLORIFY JESUS TO HIS DISCIPLES.

(Ch. xvi. 5–15.)

The μεθ' ὑμῶν ἤμην is now followed by the proper *farewell*, which the Lord here resumes, repeating what had already been said, deepening and illustrating by new views His former words, and summing them all up with great and mysterious disclosures pointing entirely to the *future*. Berlenb. Bible: "Now comes the main announcement of His *departure*." That is, as we have said before, the most complete and direct indication of all that which should *follow out of and after His going away*, prepared and obtained solely through that. All is primarily concentrated in the *coming of the Comforter*, who, as on the one hand He manifests and consummates the *separation* of the believing from the world, so not the less on the other hand works continually

Hosted by Google

for the abolition of this distinction. He has therefore a double office and work: first, to convince the world, that many may become obedient to the truth, and make their appeal to the righteousness of God against their sin, and escape the judgment of the devil; but then also to guide the *disciples* (those also thus won) so far into the whole living truth, that Christ shall be glorified before them and in them. This is the substance of the whole down to ver. 15, where once more begins the announcement of His departure and the consolatory declaration of its consequences.

Ver. 5. The common arrangement of the sentence is not to be changed. Kuinoel interposes a stop, and refers the *νῦν δὲ ὑπάγω* to the former clause, *καὶ οὐδείς* beginning a new sentence. "For I was yet with you, but now I go to Him who sent Me. (Then a pause which gives the disciples time, as if expecting something from them.) And yet no one asks Me!"[1] But to what purpose is this? *But now I go My way*, immediately connected with *I was with you*, appears to us flat and meaningless; nor is that feeling removed by the solution, "Hitherto I have not told you this, because I was with you, but now I can and I may not longer be silent." But as a *new beginning* farewell discourse, it obtains a quite different sense—I *go* now (as so often said already)—and ye are only silent and bewildered, instead of asking and seeking, as I would have you do!

I go My way *now actually*, after having said so much concerning it—still more direct and penetrating farewell! To Him who hath sent Me, to the Father,—as ver. 28, ch. xiv. 2, 12, and before to the Jews, ch. vii. 33. That this *ὑπάγειν* here embraces the death, resurrection, and ascension, we have been plainly taught since the beginning of ch. xiv. But here there is specially involved—Thus *My* mission, the office and work to discharge which I came, comes to its end on earth (comp. Tob. xii. 20, the word of the apocryphal angel):—wherefore do ye not *ask* at the last moment in which I stand to teach, and to answer,[2] concerning the proper end and conclusion of My office, concerning the cause and the effect of My departure, lying in

[1] Or, with Hess and others, this last, as a question, and no man asketh Me—?

[2] As long as He is here as teacher, the great matter is to *ask Him!*

Hosted by Google

the invisible world? For this much ye know and feel, that I, neither in you nor in the world, have completed anything yet! Do ye not confide in Me and in My Father, that it is in My departure that the whole mystery of My manifestation will be solved?—Do ye not desire earnestly to know this, and to understand it to your joy?—The Lord evidently longs, standing before the confounded and silent disciples to whom He had spoken so much, for a word of affectionate response and understanding sympathy. But it must be a word of actual response, of really intelligent sympathy, entering into the spirit of His words. It may at first seem strange that He should ask for only *ποῦ ὑπάγεις;* especially after having just said *πρὸς τὸν πέμψαντά με.* Hence Stark would interpret, Ye ask, and rightly, no longer about the *Ποῦ*, that is, *ye now full well know* that I am going to the Father, *and nevertheless* ye are so sad! But this neither corresponds with the condition of the disciples, nor is it reconcilable with the simple meaning of the *but.* Assuredly the *sorrow* is the reason why they have no spirit nor desire to question; their words, and almost their thoughts failing them. Thus the Lord desires their question, and feels it wanting. But had they not more than once asked before? Hence Grotius took the meaning to be—Ye ask *no longer;* and Klee, They had so eagerly asked before, but now yield all up to sorrow! Lücke even finds, with de Wette, "an indistinctness in the whole statement," since ver. 6 ought to precede *καὶ οὐδείς;* for it should be, Ye are so sorrowful that ye cannot ask even once more; and the Lord's meaning, "Better an unintelligent *ποῦ ὑπάγεις*, than this dumb disconsolateness." But we cannot believe that the Lord would have that first, unintelligent question repeated; and therefore must (with most of the ancients) more worthily explain His always pregnant words. "Those former questions were to Jesus as none,"—so say we with v. Gerlach, and regard Him as desiring a question more truly earnest, more deeply penetrating, with *confidence* and *gladness* responding to His thoughts; comp. ch. xiv. 28. The first question of Peter, ch. xiii. 36, was not the right asking, for it proceeded from unintelligent forwardness—unintelligent, as if the Lord spoke of an earthly journey (as ch. vii. 35)—forwardness, I can and I will go with Thee! (as Matt. viii. 19.) And Thomas' word, ch. xiv. 5, though it was

Hosted by Google

not, as many think, an oppressed utterance of confusion and ignorance, was yet rather an objection (we do not know!) than a becoming question,—therefore that was not the right. The proper asking now would have been—*Wherefore*, and *for what* goest Thou to the Father? and it is this which we must regard as the undertone of meaning; but in His mournful condescension the Lord expresses it again only by *ποῦ*—not such an unintelligent one as the former does He desire, but—Ah, if ye would begin again with your *ποῦ ὑπάγεις*, uttered in earnestness and thoughtfully, in faith and in love! In *this* sense He designedly refers back to that first questioning.

Rambach founds on this text an application to "culpable remissness in investigating Divine truths"—and this is not merely a fruitful homiletic application, but the inmost spirit of the sentence as taken out of its context. There is a curious and forbidden questioning (2 Tim. ii. 23)—as *e.g.*, on this very passage concerning the *local ποῦ* of Christ's departure, the concealed mysteries of His exaltation and glorification. But, apart from this, we should never be too idle or too sorrowful to investigate and inquire from the impulse of faith and love, and with an eager desire of saving knowledge; and the question of all questions must be ever that which touches the *departure of Christ*. The original unfolding of the text which Helferich gives, lies further from its true meaning: "How do we attain the wisdom to adapt ourselves to God's ways, but by asking *God*, *ourselves*, and our *neighbour*—*Whither goest thou?*" Yet this, better than many expositions, hits the point of the *ποῦ ὑπάγεις*, and the question concealed in it which the Lord would bring out—What in God's counsel, wisdom, and love is the issue for Thee and for us, what is the *scope and end* of Thy departure? Calvin: Expavescitis neque reputatis, quo discedam *aut in quem finem*. See the answer presently afterwards given by our Lord *to this*, in ver. 7.

Ver. 6. The same disciples who afterwards, when the risen Lord ascended to heaven, returned to Jerusalem with great joy, without any sorrow for the separation (Lu. xxiv. 52)—could not rejoice now at the *beginning* of His departure through death (Jno. xiv. 28), but were only *troubled*. Thus had it been since Matt. xvii. 23. Sorrow, the Lord says, hath *filled* your heart

Hosted by Google

(Grot. obsedit plane, Acts v. 3)—so entirely seized upon them and carried them away that they cannot any further think of the ὑπάγω which amazed them, not even of the ποῦ which is connected with it. Hezel is perhaps too strong, "Just as if My death were a lower *accident*, opposing My designs! as if it were not involved in the great plan of God which I must carry out!" Afterward he is more sound, "Just as if I had confirmed you in false ideas of a Messiah, and My death baffles your calculation!" only that it was not merely the baffling of their expectation which so troubled the disciples' hearts, but at the same time and *still more* the loss of their beloved Master, the disruption of the "precious familiarity" of intercourse with Him.[1] Sorrow in itself as appointed and well founded (vers. 20–22) is not blamed; but the πεπλήρωκεν was too much, as Rieger says, "Sorrow, fear, and the like, may be turned into holy ardour, faith and patience being brought by it to purity; but to let the heart be carried away by such emotions brings only hurt after it." Therefore the Lord would gladly have spared and removed from His beloved disciples that which as ταράσσεσθαι was too much for their hearts through their lack of faith and understanding; therefore it was that He continued so long teaching and comforting them, seeming as if scarce able to cease. And the words which, while they corrected the *sorrow*, stimulated their courage, gained this end that they did not altogether sink under their grief. Here once more He rebukes so graciously as if at the same time excusing their well-known weakness! Lampe: "Under this gentle rebuke there lies a tacit consolation. For, while He charges them with having neglected the question, *Whither goest Thou?* He teaches them that all was before His own mind. While He accuses their negligence, He gives them their own excuse, that it had arisen from excess of sorrow. And this is the emphasis of the particle ἀλλά." The

[1] Not, as Luther, conversely. After he has preached of the "gracious and sweet familiarity of fellowship," and how "sad a thing it was to lose such a Lord," he continues, "But that was all the greater because they had set their hearts on His being a mighty Lord and King, etc. They now lose both the sweet fellowship, and the glorious prospects they had formed, and all their confidence." We think that the disciples had so far advanced that the former was the chief thing with them, even in the other; they had no longer any joy in the thought of a kingdom of God without Jesus.

Hosted by Google

Berlenb. Bible: "The Lord knoweth our frame, and of what stuff we are made. And of this we can remind Him. Heb. iv. 15."

Ver. 7. As always, so now also I tell you *the truth!* (ch. viii. 46.) Even though it oppose all your knowledge, feeling, will, and desire, believe this time My truth, which I *unasked* will yet more plainly tell you! *It is good for you,* rather your highest advantage, that I—*go away* from you, that I *die!* Significantly first the ἀπελθεῖν before the πορευθῆναι,[1] hence to be strictly explained, That I *go away*—if I *go not away*—but when I have *gone thither.* The grievous "*away* from *us*" had stood before and darkened to the disciples the gracious promise of "*hence* to the Father:" this was the veil over their hearts, for they certainly (according to the protest of ch. xiv. 28, here also to be thought of) had considered themselves rather than Him. They took it for granted, without much thought upon it, that *to Him,* the pure and holy, death would be no suffering or ruin,—but *their* irreparable loss, the impending presence of which filled their souls! In precise opposition to these views the Lord points in silent contrast to the fact that *to Him* the departure to the Father through the death of a sinner for sins' sake would indeed be very bitter (ch. xii. 27)—but all the more does He turn it into a συμφέρει ὑμῖν. Thus does the love speak which does not look at its own. But the misunderstanding which, through lack of experience, knows not how much more we receive from fellowship with Jesus in the Spirit than we could receive from His visible presence in itself, confuses itself even to this day with the thought and the wish—Ah that He were with us now, as then! "It might be thought"—so pursues Storr—"that if Jesus Himself had remained with His disciples, they would have needed no other Helper in His place; and though thus the *loss* of His visible presence was to be compensated by the assistance of an invisible Spirit, it was at least no gain or advantage to them that Jesus had gone from them." But the "abiding ever" of the Messiah (ch. xii. 34) would have done *nothing* for them; that would not have accomplished redemption, or *compensated for* the obtaining and sending of the

[1] The two critical points in the ὑπάγειν, see already ch. xiv. 23.

Hosted by Google

Holy Ghost. The primary thought which, in the analogy of human relations generally, finds here its grandest application, is that which we have already made prominent—that only after the withdrawal of the sensible presence of a teacher and master his abiding and influential spirit is truly set free and penetrates our being. But there is something quite different here, there is, over and above, the *obtaining* and the *sending* of the Spirit in a sense for which human relations furnish no analogy.

The first obvious thought was made prominent by Augustin: Si carni carnaliter hæseritis, *capaces* spiritus *non* eritis. Dräseke enters well into this: "The old Messiah in the flesh is with them, *therefore* the new Comforter, the Spirit, is far from them. What hindered their being comforted? Jesus Himself, who, comforting, stood before them, was the hindrance! As long as He, this Messiah, bearing all the prophetic marks upon Him, stood before them in person, this His person continued to be a foundation and prop to that system of vanities which bewitched their heads and hearts. The Form must pass away from their eyes, before the Spirit could enter their souls. It was good for them that Jesus should go away. Before He went away, the Christ after the flesh, the Christ after the Spirit could not come. When the former vanished, the latter appeared." But when we have firmly established the truth of this, a truth which the Apostle who had not been with Him from the beginning pointed out, 2 Cor. v. 16, we must show the error and perversion of going no further, and of deducing from this disappearance of Jesus according to the flesh the consequence of the manifestation of Christ according to the Spirit, *in such a manner* as Dräseke does in this last sentence. He carries that error to its last point, when he continues, "We must not, moreover, understand this as if the Son of man had not *power* on earth already to *send* them the Spirit. (What! send from the earth?) Had not all the words which He spake to them been spirit and life?[1] But *they* had not the *capacity* to receive the Spirit, on account of the Christ in the flesh who was among them as an earthly person." O no, that was not all! Although all pædagogic preparation of our susceptibility up to the day of Pentecost

[1] See on this false exposition our exposition on ch. vi.

Hosted by Google

from the Old Testament, holds good and belongs to the question; and although even for this was necessary, as previously the manifestation, life, teaching, and acts of Christ in the flesh, so afterward His removal in order that through His cross those who believe in Him should die to all carnal hopes of a Messiah —yet here the question is of much more than *our* susceptibility, it is also of the *justice of God* in atonement, and of the glorification of the *Son of man in Himself*, before which He by no means had *the power* to send the Spirit. (Ch. vii. 38, 39; Acts ii. 33.) To pass over and leave out *this* mystery of the *ὑπάγειν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*, *here* in ver. 7 (as afterwards again, ver. 10), where it is properly essential, is an exegetical sin of which alas too many are guilty. O no! although everything, the coming, living, teaching of the Lord, was *expedient for us* as preparatory for our redemption, this was fully accomplished only by means of His departure to the Father *through death* (which is never to be lost sight of in that departing!)—and this too has its reason much deeper than in a salutary withdrawal of His visible form. The great consequence, which is so strongly maintained by the negation *ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ—οὐκ ἐλεύσεται*, has its ground not merely in *πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, but in the consummation of His mediating Person, in all pertaining to it that is atoning and redeeming. (Heb. ii. 9, 10, 14, 15.) And this comes out still more definitely if we read, as we have good reason to do, Lachmann's significant *ἐγώ* a third time,—*ἐὰν γὰρ ἐγὼ μὴ ἀπέλθω*. "The blessing of the Spirit was the counterpart of taking away the curse" —is the Berl. Bible's concise remark, according to Gal. iii. 13, 14. But as that which was once for all accomplished in Christ for the world, only by degrees is appropriated and perfected in His disciples, so that first crucifixion of the disciples with Him, that sorrow out of which the joy of the new man was to be born, is also the progressive way for us all to a more intimate and perfect internal coming of the Spirit; and thus in all further fellowship with the sufferings of Christ, which might seem to us to be His going away from us, the Comforter repeats to us this prototypic word of consolation—*It is expedient for you!*

I will *send* unto you the Holy Ghost—is the Lord's constant word. But "Jesus never tells *how* it will be in His sending of the Spirit, and that makes our learned worldly wise very unbe-

Hosted by Google

lieving; they devise all manner of methods, but cannot get the right." (Oetinger.) Therefore they imagine a Spirit *abiding* in the words, who was already upon earth though he could not before penetrate, instead of *coming* from heaven sent from the Father: and thus they contradict all Scripture and experience. The blessed disciples themselves are the clearest evidence of what degree of the influence of God's Spirit they had actually within themselves, as Israel might possess it up to this time—and how far the essential *Paraclete*, whose revelation bore the same relation to all former רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים as the incarnation of Christ bore to all former appearances and energies of the angel of the covenant, was yet *to come*. From the time of Gen. vi. 3 the Spirit (who is indeed and worketh everywhere) had been and had been working in the world; Israel especially possessed Him, partly in the greater number of believers in Him as a Spirit of righteousness, that is, also of truth,—as the πνεῦμα δουλείας; and partly, in the anticipating hommes de désir (as St Martin says, comp. אִישׁ חֲמֻדוֹת, Dan. x. 11),—as the πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ προμαρτυρόμενον (1 Pet. i. 11). All things proceed in mankind and in Christendom with similar preparations, but the consummating day of Pentecost now as in the time of the first disciples comes only to those who receive a preached Gospel in faith *through the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven*. (1 Pet. i. 12.)

Ver. 8. I will send Him *unto you*, the Lord had said, and yet He now speaks of the *world*, which He was to convince. Quite obviously—*through* you and your then resulting testimony; hence with καὶ ἐλθών we must once more connect πρὸς ὑμᾶς—When He has come to you and into you, then will He do this! "The Apostles were to convince the unbelieving and hating world, maintain their right against it and conquer it by the truth they testified—what a task was this! The first link of connection then is, The Holy Ghost would defend them against the hatred of the world, in their behalf He would chastise and rebuke the persecutors and *convince them that His professors are right*." (Oetinger.) In this discourse, however,—the following words of which, simple as they are profound, furnish a special testing problem for all fundamental exposition,—the thoughts proceed from this point of departure far away into the fulness of

Hosted by Google

that comprehensive view, backward, forward, and inward, out of which the Lord spoke them.

Here we have the other aspect of ch. xiv. 17 opened to us, and that previous utterance is essentially restricted. The same world which cannot receive the Spirit because it seeth Him not nor knoweth Him, must nevertheless become conscious that He is working upon it, speaking to it, and chiefly—*testifying against it!* Thus the world's unsusceptibility for the truth was not to be understood as absolute or unchangeably fixed; thus the same Spirit of the truth, through whose coming as its first effect the distinction between the world and the disciples, between believers and unbelievers, is evidenced and stamped, works nevertheless continually in order to the abolition of this distinction. For, His coming and working is the last stage of the Divine economy of grace before the day of judgment, Acts ii. 20, comp. Joel ii. 5. In His dispensation there is salvation for many whom the Lord will call. The last, most effectual, most inwardly penetrating, *calling* to salvation, the final and full separation from the world, begins—and that not otherwise than as the call of Christ, like that of all the prophets, to repent! Where through the rejection of Christ the last degree of unpardonable guilt, of incurable sin, of irremovable hardening has been reached; and that which was spoken of in ch. xv. 22–25 is accomplished in its full meaning (though this, as the sequel shows, is far from the case with all)—then there remains no more than the testimony to sin, and the prediction of judgment. For the day of the Holy Ghost (the third after the economy of the Father and the Son, as the type in Ex. xix. 10, 11 intimates) is at the same time the figurative representation of (ἀντίτυπος) and the preparation for the last day. When now the superaboundingly merciful testimony of the Spirit against the sin of Israel and the Gentiles in its first consummate exhibition comes with its fiery tokens and inward burning, and not yet the fire of final wrath—this is the *beginning* of that judgment of the nations unto peace of which Isa. ii. 3, 4 prophesies as the end to be accomplished among the heathen, and Jer. iv. 3, 4 as the typical beginning and end of the whole destiny of Israel. The sentiment, so often misunderstood and perverted, that the world's history is the world's judgment, has

Hosted by Google

its truth in this working and judging of the Spirit, this final preparation for the judgment to be revealed, which again must tarry for its consummation until that personal appearance of the Son to which the Spirit points the church. What the Holy Ghost finds now upon *earth*, of faith or unbelief, He by no means leaves as it is, but works upon it now first effectually, seizing it in its crisis, in order that the faith may be perfected in the knowledge and in the life—or if that cannot be, may be brought to confusion; in order that that unbelief by the final contempt of the Spirit may become ripe for doom—or be overcome unto repentance and obedience. The great end of this never-failing influence, which brings forward the final judgment into the process of the world's history, through the perfecting of sin or righteousness—the final conviction of both, in fact, is clearly expressed at the close of Scripture, in that book which must be regarded as beyond all others the book of the calling, attracting, and judging *Spirit* before the end comes. (Rev. xxii. 11, 12.) These hints of the *scriptural system*, which is truly the already disclosed system of the Divine government of the world, will teach us more deeply than is usual to understand how appropriately and fully the ἐλέγξει of this passage belongs in all aspects to the coming of the Spirit. This typically or preparatorily reproving conviction or over-testimony of the Holy Ghost, which actually already condemns and yet absolves all who submit to *this* condemnation, is the necessary and final expression of spiritual judgment. The ἐλέγχειν is not the same with μαρτυρεῖν, ch. xv. 26; for the testimony is of what is good and true (concentred in περὶ ἐμοῦ), but the reproof is against the evil and the false, through the revelation of sin, and the taking away of *false* righteousness. But it must not be overlooked that even this ἐλέγχειν does no more than complete and carry out that μαρτυρεῖν,[1] that the Spirit is still the last gift of grace to the world, *in order that* the world, or every man in the world who will, may be saved. He who penitently confesses, I am guilty! is also to be acquitted. For the Spirit convinces not merely of *sin* and of *judgment*, as *we* might have expected it to be said—these two essentially belonging one to the other, with nothing else between them—but previously, in the centre of His exhibition,

[1] In the deepest sense of the prophetic word cited in Matt. xii. 20.

Hosted by Google

of the *righteousness* of Christ which the hitherto unbeliever may at once and shall appropriate when he believes. Brückner and de Wette deny this double aspect of the testimony, the second influence leading to faith; but he who livingly and practically enters into the text cannot give it up. Even Schleiermacher hits the point rightly: "The reproof, that is, the bringing to view of our own unrighteousness, could not be without a gracious revelation and offer of the true righteousness; even the judgment is exhibited before the world only *in order where possible to turn its thought to Him* who frees all who believe from condemnation."[1] Lange does not go too far: "This condemning administration of the Spirit among men establishes a boundless extension of saving grace throughout the world, more glorious than the Jewish limitation of the disciples could then grasp: hence the Lord presently adds, I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now."

Thus *not merely* as defensor caussæ[2] for Christ and His people, who are such that they may be able to reprove all others, does the Holy Spirit so convincingly testify; but in order to convert, absolve, and comfort every man who submits to His reproof—see 2 Tim. ii. 25, 26. The reproving office necessarily precedes the comforting. The Paraclete does not, properly speaking, perform "a strange work, before He comes to *His own* work, that of comforting and preaching grace" (as Luther says)—but the ἐλέγχειν also, before as in the μαρτυρεῖν, belongs in its final and full meaning to Him alone. In a certain sense it is assuredly true that "whatsoever reproves sin is and belongs to the law"—but inasmuch as by the Spirit, through the glorified Son, God now first properly speaks from heaven, from the upper *Zion* of redemption, the word of the Spirit is really the perfected law, the Sinaitic law only the type and preparation for this (Heb. xii. 18–25). And it is narrow and incorrect to say, that "the Holy Ghost rebukes *through the law*, making all sin which is not *faith*"—for the law is in no sense of faith, as Gal. iii. 12 profoundly and with fulness of meaning says; while of *faith* speaks also, and that in way of

[1] Homil. über Joh. ii. 518.

[2] Whose office is ἐλέγχειν τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας, Tit. i. 9, as Grotius here says.

Hosted by Google

conviction, *only* the Gospel. We shall rather see that the reproof of the Spirit brings something new and different in addition to the first, narrowly so-called, law; that *His* witness of sin has only to be received and rightly *understood* in order itself to appear no other than a testimony for the righteousness of grace to faith, and as such a spiritual comforting.

In the three great words ἁμαρτία, δικαιοσύνη, κρίσις the Lord names the three all-embracing essential elements of truth and its whole procedure.[1] The world has no perfect and correct knowledge of what *sin* is, what *righteousness*, what *judgment*, until the Holy Ghost has explained these words. It does, indeed, pride itself, holding up its πρόφασις, in its first superficial knowledge of them (for where is the man who has not some knowledge of these three great facts?)—but inasmuch as it tarries there, *it perverts the beginning of truth into a contradiction to its end*, into delusion and lie. No man can be brought to an experimental and perfect knowledge of these three words, so current in the world, and present to every conscience,[2] by any human power or human wisdom, not even by the external influence of any letter of the *word*, or any fact of the *work*, even though it be of Christ and His Apostles, or the undeniable acts and wonders of the Lord since the day of Pentecost. This is the office of the *Spirit* alone, and that *as* Spirit, by the mediation indeed of the word and the work, yet only so far as these are made *inwardly* efficient in the heart and conscience. Hence, they are wrong, and go not below the surface, who here assert and show how the Spirit convinced and overcame the world, Israel to wit, by certain *external events*.[3] O no, the

[1] Bahrdt, after his fashion, here remarked, "will convince the world of the three greatest errors which have ruined human hopes."

[2] So that the Holy Ghost finds everywhere a foundation for His influence, but only such as He must rearrange. Luthardt's notion that the absence of the articles presents the three points as not definite but general well-known truths, is inappropriate and over-minute literality. It is not the substance of the conviction that "*there is* sin, righteousness, and judgment," for we may reasonably ask—Did the world know nothing of these before? Rather, *What* is essentially sin, that is, the true sin, etc.

[3] Orthodox and heterodox writers are daily giving illustrations of this view. Most strangely says J. v. Müller, quite forgetting the complement of the internal history:—"Convinced of the sin of unbelief by the down-

Hosted by Google

ἐλέγξει reaches on to the end of time, as long and as far as there will be a κόσμος; using the instrumentality both of a continuous testimony of word, and an ever new exhibition of facts, but exerting His convincing influence only through an inward speaking, and an internal testimony.

Est autem vis non *coactiva* sed *convictiva*—says Lampe at first, in the right way to discern in this ἐλέγχειν the domain committed to human will; and he even goes on, Non agit tanquam cum stipite, sed tanquam cum creaturâ rationali, *persuadendo*. Yes truly, if the Holy Ghost does thus deal with men, His last *gratia* must be as well *resistibilis* as *irresistibilis*. So far irresistible as that all must in the end, whether they will or not, be *convinced* of the truth of God; but *it remains with themselves* whether they submit and obey, turn to the truth from the lie, in order that they may be saved—or not. When Lampe further ventures to write as follows concerning the difference between obeying and refusing, he sets the predestinarian dogma in its most pernicious and fearful light:—The cause of this difference is *not* in men, but *in the operation itself of the Spirit*, which, acting according to the eternal decree of God, works *with less evidence and efficacy in the reprobate* than in the elect! Where is there a syllable of this minor evidentia et efficacia in this ἐλέγχει for all the world alike? Thus does a foregone conclusion in theology pervert the eternal words which might rectify its error.

In the following words the Lord Himself expounds what He meant by these three great *objects* of conviction; and we hope that the way has been paved by our intimations for the most universal and profound sense of the whole, so that this evolution of His meaning may be otherwise understood than superficial exposition too frequently exhibits it. Much more is here declared than what George Müller,[1] for example, says: "He will convince the world by the Apostles that their unbelief in Jesus is sin, that He was righteous, and that He would be victorious over His enemies." Or B.-Crusius: "The *result* of the influence

fall of their city, of the righteousness or innocence of Christ by His resurrection, of the judgment of the world-prince by—the actual undeniable planting of the faith!"

[1] Vom Glauben der Christen, ii. 143.

Hosted by Google

of the Spirit will be *reproving* for the world, *exalting* as to Christ, and *mighty* in its cause."[1]

Ver. 9. The thrice repeated ὅτι, on which we must pause a while, has been often translated by *because;* and this does not in many respects alter the sense, but it does not exhaust it, as we shall see. B.-Crusius is here right in insisting (with August., Chrys., Luther) that ὅτι (concerning this, that—as ch. ix. 17) defines in all three instances the *matter of the testimony.*[2] This alone harmonises with the connection, since the Lord cannot possibly presuppose them already to understand the mysterious περὶ ἁμαρτίας of ver. 8; and therefore He enters upon the individual points not as *giving the deep reason*, but obviously as *explaining* what He meant. Still more plainly: The ὅτι gives us the *thing signified* in ἁμαρτία, δικαιοσύνη, κρίσις, tells us *what kind* of sin, righteousness, and decision of judgment He means.

Thus the Lord means first specifically the sin of *unbelief*, as in ch. xv. 22, 24, x. 41. This is no more here than in ch. viii. 46 a mere error; but it is the foundation and crown, the fruit and kernel, the true essential substance of all *sin* of the evil will. As Jesus Himself had not rebuked their trespass against the commandments, which was the work of Moses and the prophets before Him, but their not believing in Himself, so also the Holy Spirit His Representative continues and consummates the same charge. He confirmingly, and if necessary awakingly, connects His testimony with that already existing in the *law* and in *conscience* both for Jews and Gentiles against sin—but He nevertheless reproves now in quite another sense. If the ὅτι is *explanatory*, the view must be incorrect which Lampe

[1] Further: Properly speaking there is but one thought, The triumph of His cause—but the words take a threefold division probably with allusion to the *three witnesses* in judicial matters!—Not much better than the tria caussarum genera of Grotius: publica judicia de criminibus, περὶ ἁμαρτίας—privata ex æquo et bono, δικαιοσύνη—privata certam ex lege formulam habentia, κρίσις.

[2] Luthardt is once more over subtle. The ὅτι means not "concerning this, that," but "on the ground of whom"—on My account,—if he only understands this aright! The "*object* of the testimony" is already mentioned before—on My account! But the ὅτι brings first in addition the explanation how this object, thus mentioned, is here intended. And does not this at last come to the same thing?

Hosted by Google

adopts, according to which ἁμαρτία in ver. 8 means not this or that sin, but the general condition of sin and guilt, while ver. 9 brings forward the specific sin of unbelief—as an *example*, one standing for a thousand. It is amazing how mechanically men sincere and scripturally learned can sometimes deal with the profoundest words of Scripture! Was it then needful that the Spirit should now first come into the world, to rebuke *sin generally?* Could the Lord have so signified in ver. 8 itself! But in the fullest sense, by a conviction now first thoroughly *penetrating*, He will assuredly reprove *all* sin, He will, that is, grasp it in its *root*, and bring that to light in its *fruit*. The Spirit of Christ according to the economy of the law takes up the work where it was found before the law since Gen. vi. 3; He begins, as it were, with the world from the beginning again, but now first seizes sin in its inmost depth and principle, after it had entirely disclosed itself through the rejection of the Son of God made flesh. Of all *human* sin the original *root*, the fall of Adam and Eve not excluded,[1] was no other than unbelief in God. (1 Pet. iii. 20; Heb. iii. 19.) And so in the continuance, increase, and out-growth of sin, this again becomes in strengthened vigour its *consequence* and *fruit*. We may say with truth in respect to their reciprocal influence that—Thou sinnest generally and continually because thou hast not believed the first truth of God; and, thou believest not His last truth because thou hast persisted and wilt persist in sinning. The crown of unfolded sin, that in which *its principle must be disclosed, hatred of God*, is now, as was prototypically shown in Israel, and is ever being exhibited anew in the world and in Christendom, specifically unbelief *in Christ*. That is in a penultimate stage, in which the sin thus convicted of may and must yet stumble at the grace of the risen Saviour; the last stage enters in as wilful blasphemous rejection of the Holy Ghost. It is most certain, however boldly the world contradicts it, and a truth which should constantly be pressed upon its reflection, that its unbelief is a matter of perverse will, the consequence of such wicked resistance of will as refuses to let sin be taken away by the Lamb of God. Let the Elberfeld *Zeitung* (tanquam unum ex mille!) declare the truth of the

[1] It may not be said of the *devils* that they did not believe, Jas. ii. 19.

Hosted by Google

favourite lie to be demonstrated—"faith is not a matter of will, its absence not morally imputed therefore, and by no means decisive for judgment;" but Richter's Hausbibel states a truth which must be firmly held fast, "The Holy Ghost reproves the world of *lying* when it pretends that its unbelief is *honest doubt*, etc." This, however, well understood: in its primary manifestation unbelief may consist in this, though never altogether and alone; this may so mingle with it as partially to be its excuse; but *when* the Holy Ghost, more deeply penetrating, *testifies of Christ*, then can He at once *reprove* unbelief as sin which is deliberately retained. As it is, each passes over into the other, and both *reciprocally* presuppose each other.

And it is to be understood that on account of the ἁμαρτία of unbelief *all previous* sin and transgression, hitherto condemned by the law and by grace placed under the πάρεσις, Rom. iii. 25, abides on the guilty head: all is comprehended in this unbelief, and now first is gathered into one. (Hence chap. viii. 24, ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις.) The world goes on in sin *because* it believeth not—that is presupposed; the meaning of the word, however, calls therefore *that* its abiding sin κατ' ἐξοχήν, the sin which retains the guilt of all others, *that* it doth not believe. So, further, it is plain (as preparatory to the second clause) that all denying and concealing sin in those who have no faith in Christ is no other than delusion and mockery of a wilful sort; all supposed righteousness is turned to sin, and as such reproved while unbelief remains. There are many, indeed, who even think they *believe*, and persecute on that supposition; but where sin remains, it is *evidence* of unbelief in the heart, and the ἔλεγχος of the Spirit passes from reproof of sin generally to reproof of the unbelief in which it abides. Mark, mark diligently that the Spirit does not *create* and *give*, unconditionally and without the decision of men, faith in its first original; but He *demands* it, and rebukes unbelief as sin! But in this rebuke, when it is rightly understood and accepted, there is an inexhaustible consolation; absolution being offered in the very terms of the condemnation. *He who* believeth in Him is not condemned, hath no longer sin; therefore thus *believe*, if thou still canst and wilt, and thou art at once helped in doing so. The reproof of unbelief is at once a *proffer of faith* (Acts xvii. 31)—an offer

Hosted by Google

of all strength and grace requisite in order to it.[1] This Christ is thy *righteousness*, Satan's power and right in thee is done away through Him.[2]

Ver. 10. We have now fundamentally to refute the favourite notion of the Rationalists,—not theirs alone, but adopted by orthodox expositors of older and more recent times—according to which the Lord means *nothing else* and nothing beyond this, that the Holy Ghost would convince the world of *His own* righteousness and that of His cause, that He had been rejected as innocent and righteous, and thus those who believe in Him had a righteous cause[3]—with whatever else has been added to this view. Thus understood, the resurrection and ascension indicated in the following ὑπάγω would give the ground of evidence —thus the ὅτι would not be *declarative*, as we before received it. Grotius somewhat modifies this, making δικαιοσύνη stand absolutely, being to be completed by θεοῦ, thus: The Spirit will show that *God* is a just ruler, as having received Me, beyond all invasion of injury (this is what He meant, ye shall not see Me, as above ch. vii. 36) into the fellowship of His majesty." Hezel thought that "the going to the Father must be the δικαιοσύνη itself," thus, id quod justum est; and "the Spirit should convince of this, that *thus it was* fit, it must be so that I should go to the Father through death"—that is, in opposition to their false notions, the true Messiah must actually die! Most of that class of expositors, however, held simply to the conviction of the Lord's own righteousness and innocence. What shall we say to this? First of all, we recognise the truth which is in the error, and admit that in St John's phraseology we are not to understand δικαιοσύνη, as in St Paul's, to mean a righteousness

[1] This last must ever be the initiative of God, and of His working—thus my critic Münchmeyer consoles himself concerning my Semi-pelagianism! But God's influence *works* faith only in those *who believe*. 1 Thess. ii. 13 and 2 Thess. iii. 3 lays the guilt of not believing on unreasonable and wicked men alone.

[2] Let the supremely superficial and foolish words of Grotius be set against this exposition. "The sin of the unbelieving Jews will be revealed —by what? When all things shall happen which I have spoken concerning the Spirit to be sent (did the Jews know then all this?)—it will appear that I am a Prophet, according to the test of Deut. xviii. 22."

[3] Augustin: arguitur mundus de justitiâ eorum qui credunt. But he did not make this the only meaning.

Hosted by Google

to be imputed, a justification; rather that *primarily* the words refer to the δικαιοσύνη Χριστοῦ. We admit that the added clauses with ὅτι define the genitives thus: ἁμαρτία τοῦ κόσμου (that *they* do not believe)—δικαιοσύνη scil. ἐμοῦ (that *I* go to the Father)—and so κρίσις τοῦ ἄρχοντος τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. But the full and perfect sense, wherefore and to what end *the world* must be convinced both of Christ's righteousness and Satan's judgment, after the conviction of its sin, is by no means exhausted, indeed scarcely touched by this. We have equal, nay greater right to supply, for the application to the world which the Holy Spirit was to effect in the conviction of these three great principles, τοῦ κόσμου in all three cases. For if their sin is shown to the world, was not the Spirit of grace to show and to offer *to them* a righteousness also; was He to leave them or cast them at once, separated from the righteous Christ, into the condemnation of Satan? Thus, although the most important authorities among the ancients hold to the idea that the righteousness of Christ alone must be thought of in the second clause,[1] and similarly among the moderns, Beza, Bengel, Morus, Tittmann, Olshausen, Tholuck, and Lücke, we cannot possibly content ourselves with this, but find in the *righteousness of Christ* only the *foundation* for the *offer and exhibition* of this righteousness to every man who *believeth*. Klee says rightly, though without establishing his point clearly, "that He is the Righteous per eminentiam, the Holy One of God, *and* the Sanctification and Justification of the world." And Roos expresses the transition passably well, "How righteous must He be who will go to the Father from the cross and the grave! Thus will the Holy Ghost convince the world that I am a Righteous man, and truly *Righteousness for man*. Thus He who would cast about for a righteousness which should be valid before God must—believe in Me!" There is provided for the world after all an absolution from their sin, and Christ has gone to the Father, *not* indeed to condemn the world, but—the prince of this world.[2] Does not

[1] Chrys., Theophyl., Euthym. The last: "The mark of His righteousness that He went to the Father to be with Him for ever"—which Tholuck accepts, and compares 1 Tim. iii. 16, *was justified in the Spirit.*

[2] So Lange, only that he incorrectly took *righteousness* at once for justification.

Hosted by Google

this clearly lie in the connection with what follows? Otherwise there must result from the middle clause—the Christ whom your unbelief has crucified is Righteous—necessarily nothing but condemnation for the world.[1]

But now let us show the connection with the *first* clause, in order to justify this view. The *sinner* who holds fast and consummates his sin through unbelief in a Redeemer, *either* gives it all up and troubles himself not about being made *righteous*,—or, what in the most obvious sense and its most general fulfilment in the case of the Jews was the predominant fact, he imagines for himself a false *righteousness of his own*. Against *both* must the Spirit of truth bear witness; and for this we cannot enough ponder that in the second clause also, ἐλέγξει τὸν κόσμον is the foundation of περὶ δικαιοσύνης. *We* should, in the spirit of the world, and without the great solution of the Spirit, quite otherwise expound the two correlative words *sin* and *righteousness*. We should understand by sin only the transgression of the law, and solve the righteousness to our thoughts in one of these two ways: either that God alone and His Holy One is righteous, we sinners against Him therefore all the more surely condemned; or, bring forward something of our own righteousness and virtue. Between both lies the wonderful and new testimony of the Spirit in the midst. Δικαιοσύνη must assuredly —this we should hold fast, and make it our starting-point—in *application to the world* be the *opposite of* ἁμαρτία. In so far, again—let this be added, deduced as a consequence for the connection and transition—in so far as already in ver. 9 the casting down of false righteousness, which is nothing but sin in a state of unbelief, was prepared for and included, ver. 10 must attach itself *to this*, if an organic progress of thought is to be found. Thus, fully stated, "The Holy Ghost convinces the world of righteousness: partly, that it *must necessarily have* a righteousness; partly, that it cannot find that righteousness in itself; partly, that it should seek such a righteousness in another, that is, *in Christ*." So, out of the depths of practical Scripture un-

[1] A sermon of Harless (Sonntagsweihe iii. Band), gives a strange and original interpretation of ver. 10: "The righteousness of the apparent abandonment of the world by Christ"—but we enter not into this side-thought, which is out of the track of exegesis.

Hosted by Google

derstanding and use, does G. K. Rieger expound—and is he not exegetically correct? We would add to his expression, in order to vindicate it, Since the Holy Spirit has convicted the world of sin, so long as it believes not in Christ, *He has already* brought to nought all *its* "righteousness;"[1] thus the first two thoughts of Rieger lie already in this presupposition, and when *against that righteousness* the righteousness *of Christ* is witnessed, can that be otherwise intended than with the meaning *that this is and will be the only righteousness of those who believe?* As v. Gerlach urges against the modern expositors: "He convinces the world that there is a righteousness revealed in Christ, a righteousness which justifies and sanctifies the sinner."

As in the ἐλέγχος of the Holy Ghost there could not be wanting the conviction that there is *no other* righteousness than that of God in Christ, *of Christ before God*,—for the most perverse and foulest lie of sin, the true cause of the most self-relying unbelief is no other than the delusion of self-righteousness—even so could not be wanting the *offer* of the righteousness of Christ to faith, which immediately follows the exhibition of sin on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 38), and throughout the apostolical preaching. Or can we think that here, where He nevertheless designs perfectly to describe the Spirit's preaching to the world, He would keep silence *on this?* Thus the exposition which we have rejected leaves here a melancholy gap, leaves a sinful world and the righteous Christ totally sundered from each other; although in fact the Spirit everywhere offers and holds up Christ to the world—*for righteousness*.[2]

And we maintain with perfect confidence that the explanatory ὅτι accords with this alone. Lücke says, "Then it must follow as the ground of explanation that Jesus gave His life for the salvation of the world, but this does *not* lie in ὅτι ὑπάγω." We assert that it does assuredly lie in it; for this ὑπάγειν embraces, and it is sad that any should deny it, the *death* of Christ; in ver. 7 previously this ὑπάγειν was used of a ministering, obtaining, *redeeming*, departure, *consequently* not

[1] C. H. Rieger: "Even the most reasonable thoughts which an honourable world had ever had about righteousness are declared by the Spirit of God to be insufficient."

[2] See Acts iii. 20, and my Exposition in the Reden der Apostel.

Hosted by Google

otherwise now in ver. 10. Christ goeth to the Father *for us*, as our Representative and High Priest: see the thought of our text clearly expressed in Heb. ix. 24. Further, that which is added concerning the *not seeing* must refer, in order to its finding an appropriate meaning here, to *faith* in the Invisible; and thus places the righteousness of Christ *to be laid hold of* in faith in opposition to the sin of unbelief. Bengel has explained why the θεωρεῖτε, addressing the disciples, is used: Nor without reason is the word in the second person; for if any might see Jesus, the Apostles might: yet even they must *believe*, and *call all others to believe*.

All this sufficiently refutes what has been said against the *reformed* interpretation of a righteousness of Christ offered to faith. It is remarkable as justifying this exposition that (after its preparation was found in Cyril and Augustine) the *Reformers* first (Erasmus with them in this) brought to clear light the true meaning of this word of our Lord. It is in fact the only practical exposition, it is constantly forcing itself upon all preachers who base their preaching upon an experimental knowledge of the Scripture, and upon all its practical expositors. It alone accords with the actual witness of the Holy Ghost from the day of Pentecost to our own day. For we "must know no other righteousness, with which we can stand before God—than *this going of Christ to the Father*, which is no other than that He hath taken our sin upon His own back, and for the sake of it hath suffered the death of the cross, been buried, and descended into hell, not remaining however under the power of sin and death and hell, but *passing through them all* in His resurrection and ascension." (Luther.) Thus does He who is exalted give to Israel repentance and remission of sins (Acts v. 31), and *in this Man* every man who believeth is and will be justified. (Acts xiii. 39.) *That* is a righteousness *of God* according to Rom. iii. 26, sent down from heaven and valid in heaven. The test-word and motto of the Reformation —יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ or the Lord our Righteousness—may be misunderstood and perverted, but it is and must ever be the *centre* of all preaching of the Holy Ghost to the sinful and self-justifying world; and *this* is here in its necessary place declared beforehand by Christ Himself.

Hosted by Google

Ver. 11. Even the Holy Ghost (who was to do away with all accommodations, and strip off all Jewish embellishments of the truth), does not put an end to the teaching concerning a *Devil*, but rather begins it anew; a fundamental article of saving truth must be contained in this, without which we cannot perfectly understand what *sin* and what *righteousness* are, and especially what the *redemption* which creates righteousness for sinners is. He who knoweth Jesus, and contemplates the unbelief of the world, will find through the illumination of the Spirit the solution of the mystery only in what is stated in 2 Cor. iv. 4.—But how here the *judgment* upon the prince of this world (ch. xii. 31) is connected with the whole as forming the conclusion, is, after all that we said, not hard to explain. The great cause is lost by the enemy of God, the author of all sin and unrighteousness, the blinder of men's minds into unbelief of a Saviour; and it is *won for the world*, in which he has no longer either power or right. In this judgment "the victory of righteousness over sin is complete." (v. Gerlach.) It is—"a judgment, *through which the cause of our salvation, if our will only consents, is decided.*" To testify this to the world is the crown and end of the Holy Spirit's preaching; in which His conviction is either admitted for consolation and strength, or in the other case must change into an announcement of condemnation. The reproving exhibition in itself encourages, if it is truly heard; but the most gracious and inviting preaching of the Gospel, *if* unbelief opposes it, is turned into the keenest severity of punishment.

The *future* judgment to which the world is proceeding under the deciding testimony of the Spirit, has its ground in the judgment which has been already *accomplished* through the departure of Jesus, and which is *held up as future* by the Holy Ghost. On account of the atonement there is no more a hell for man: only the heaven of Jesus for those who believe in Him unto righteousness, or the hell of the devil for all who will continue *the world*. The Spirit's ἐλέγχος effects the separation in such wise that men of three sorts must be made manifest on both sides. Among those who accept it, the *penitent* who confess their *sin*, the *believing* who are justified in Christ, the *holy* who are perfectly delivered from Satan's power in the full accomplishment of their salvation. Among those who persis-

Hosted by Google

tently oppose, there are the abiding *sinners*, *unbelievers*, *condemned*. Let the opposite sides of this last clause also be carefully observed: Satan is *either* condemned to our advantage if we lay hold on *righteousness*, *or* we remain with him in condemnation if we continue as world in *sin*. By no means, as has been said, that the Spirit *now first* reproves the sin of those who do not oppose the powerless, condemned prince of this world;[1] for that would be a ὕστερον πρότερον in which the ἐλέγχος at the close would begin again at the beginning. But the reproof of *sin* was necessarily the first, and in that was everything included pertaining to it; but now, *after* the dilemma between sin and righteousness has been clearly exhibited, the Spirit finally testifies the condemnation of Satan. This He does, however, in such a way that He not only *comforts* believers with the expressed consolation of Rom. viii. 33, 34, but penetrates the *unbelieving* by a word of *most gracious offer* mingled with condemnation — *Will ye then* be and be for ever the devil's? Will ye be condemned with him?[2]

A not ungrounded observation, finally, and one which offers many useful reflections, particularly as confirming our exposition of the second clause, is the note of Bötticher — that the threefold office of the Holy Ghost has a corresponsive reference to the prophetical, high-priestly, and judicial offices of Christ.

Thus have we, as we would hope, done something toward the full understanding of this word of our Lord, which in its consequences and developments is altogether inexhaustible. We refrain from making more than one additional remark, and that is required to complete our exposition. It is, that *inasmuch* as the separation between believers and the world is not one which is at once complete, but some remains of the "world" are still in the disciples of Jesus, of course the Holy Ghost reproves *their* residue of unbelief, preaches to them reiteratedly the righteousness of Christ, sets before them more and more clearly

[1] As rightly, though in the wrong place, Helferich preaches against the disgrace of being conquered by one already conquered.

[2] Schleiermacher: "To convince the world of judgment, is to place it in the way of decision, whether it will walk with *that which* (him, who) has been already condemned, or with *that which* (Him, who) is ever proceeding from victory to victory."

Hosted by Google

the fundamental character of the difference between the Conqueror and the condemned one. As He shows to the altogether unbelieving not only their life and action, but, for example, also their books and systems thereto belonging, disclosing in these last the πρῶτον ψεῦδος, to be nothing but sin (peccatum and error), even so He reproves all in the not altogether believing which is not going ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, every *last* yet remaining ψεῦδος of their life and teaching—as *sin* through want of faith in and obedience to the truth of the Spirit. O how different is the *judgment* of the Spirit here from that which we tolerant Christians are wont to exercise; and yet His previously disciplinary judgment is the type of the final judgment at the last day.

Ver. 12. It is not merely that the Lord here passes from the one side to the other, as if the connection were—All this will the Paraclete do to the world; *to you* on the other hand, etc. But ver. 12 must be closely connected in its transitional sense with what had just been said. The ἐλέγχειν of the Spirit was to be effected through the μαρτυρεῖν of the disciples (as they probably now very well understood in general): *they* consequently must previously know, and the Lord would have to say and commit to them, all that afterwards was to be spoken to the world. Still more, as we have just seen, they themselves, in order to their becoming perfect disciples, yea even fit and worthy witnesses, must (partly beforehand, and in part continuously) be subjected to the same *conviction*. Does not the risen Lord, therefore, whose coming with light, life, and peace, was a preparatory approach of the Spirit, reprove His disciples' unbelief? (Luke xxiv. 25; Mar. xvi. 14.) Thus primarily and specifically concerning these three great things, sin, righteousness, and judgment, He has much more to say to His future witnesses which they should say to the world; similarly, apart from their office of testimony, for their own knowledge of the truth unto holiness and salvation *all* is embraced and hinted at in this Trilogy. Hence rightly Melanchthon: "The knowledge *of these things* is stupendous; that is, how great things sin and the anger of God are, and this victim of God, His own Son; how great is the glory of the reigning Messiah, how great the power of the devil, and how awful the contest between Christ and Satan:—the knowledge of all this is without limit." This is the most

Hosted by Google

obvious connection; but it must be understood that to the ἔτι πολλά much besides, yea everything belongs; and we may include it all, though Christ has not openly unfolded and perfectly told all, but left it to the teaching of the Spirit: for example, the abolition of the typical in the old covenant through its fulfilment in His sacrificial death and high-priesthood; the right position of the old law as it regards the new commandment of His new covenant; the relation of yet outstanding prophecy to the future and consummation of His kingdom—in short, everything generally which the Epistles bring in, and especially which the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse in the great conclusion unfold. They only err who regard any one in particular of these points to be reserved here, without deducing it from the connection with vers. 8–11.

It is easy to show, further, against the accommodation theory of the old Rationalism, which is once more brought forward with pitiable simplicity, that *it* finds nothing reserved in this sentence: *our* readers will gladly enter with us a litle into this point. What the Lord had said was pure *truth* (ver. 7)—otherwise the ἔτι πολλά would have been quite misplaced; the opposite is afterwards *all*, the *whole* truth, and only that in as far as it was developed from what had been already said by our Lord. It may be enough for us to quote a sentence from one of the opponents of this theory. "Our enemies twist these words of our Lord *as if they meant*—Till now I have led you into many misconceptions; when He shall come, the Spirit of truth, He will lead you into *the truth*. Hitherto I have deceived you with many fallacies, I have nourished and confirmed your superstition; but in His time ye shall understand that I have deceived you by suffering you to remain in your hereditary delusions. Your practical reason, in its purity, shall liberate you from your superstitions, etc., etc.—But Jesus does not oppose His errors, by which He had misled the disciples, to the truth which they were afterwards to know; not impure truth to pure truth; but He opposes truth to truth, the pure to the pure, the less perfect however to the perfect, the *parts* of truth to the *entire* truth, the elementary institution of religion to its more sublime and thorough knowledge." (Weber.)

Ye cannot *bear* it, βαστάζειν—that is a more gracious and

Hosted by Google

stronger expression than if He had said, Ye cannot *receive* it, χωρεῖν. The critics who in their manner decide that βαστάζειν here is equivalent to *percipere, intelligere*, superficialise the sense (although the Syr. with its לְמֵאחַד takes the lead). The *bearing* is not merely the φρενὶ βαστάζειν of Suidas, the holding and retaining of that which is inwardly received: even the parallel in Epict. Enchirid. xxix. 5 which is generally adduced is far from being strictly parallel.[1] The Lord considers the weakness of their oppressed minds (hence the *now* referring to their *present* condition, their hearts being full of sorrow): that they cannot perfectly *understand* His words He presupposes already, and will therefore lay upon them no further, no too heavy burden. (Comp. in another yet similar sense, Matt. xxiii. 4.) To hear much from the Master and yet to understand little, oppresses—the disciples assuredly thought when He thus spake, Alas, what He *has said* lies unintelligibly heavy upon our souls! A further development and exposition of these great things would have altogether *weighed them down*, without the understanding which the Spirit should first bring. Thus His saying retains in its underlying presupposition the general meaning which refers it to the whole period of the disciples' learning from the Lord's lips, that they were not yet mature and strong enough for *understanding* Him; but there is something further to be added, and which should not be overlooked, since it is of great importance for our imitation of His wisdom and love in our own teaching. To pour out prematurely to the people the whole truth, is not only useless, because it is not understood or embraced, but *it is also positively hurtful*, since the weak cannot *bear* it, and may be *cast* down by it, that is, may be led to despair under the truth.

Ver. 13. We must here remark upon two things, before entering into the specific meaning of this clause: first, that the personal ἐκεῖνος is once more designedly placed before the otherwise sufficient τὸ πνεῦμα; and then, that after all we have heard in the ὑμᾶς we must include, though with some hidden

[1] To attribute to the people a premature knowledge, which has not been livingly experienced—"to urge a dawning consciousness into confession, to enforce testimonies and assertions, to force the unfolding of the inner life, to denounce in an unhappy manner human ignorance"—is no other than uncharitableness, and tends *not* to salvation. Nitzsch.

Hosted by Google

reservation still, all future disciples who should through the Spirit's conviction be won from the world by the truth. In this alone lies our right to appropriate to ourselves this promise. Instead of εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν we read with Lachmann εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν, so that (by a significant deviation from the usual πᾶς ὁ—πᾶσα ἡ) these two things are expressed in their full force: first, by the article, that it is only one and the self-same truth which Jesus and the Holy Ghost teach;[1] and then, by the πᾶσαν, closely and emphatically connected with the ἀλήθειαν, that in opposition and contrast the Holy Ghost alone will lead into the *whole* truth. It is otherwise, therefore, than when the woman in Mark v. 33 told the Lord πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, that is, without denying or deception. Such an antithesis to untruth (the pure simple truth, and nothing else) does indeed lie in the formula which we find in Plato, Apol. Soc. cap. 1, where Socrates opposes the deceiving complainants—οὐδὲν ἀληθὲς εἰρήκασιν· ὑμεῖς δὲ μου ἀκούσεσθε πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. It is plain of itself that such a meaning is foreign to our passage, even if we adhere to the Text. Rec.; but it is a still stronger assurance against the theory of accommodation, that τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν is the oldest and surest reading. Further, that it is not said that the Holy Ghost would give the disciples the solution and explanation of *omne scibile* in heaven and upon earth, is deducible from the signification of *the truth* which pervades the N. T. and St John's writings especially, according to which it embraces only the revealed truth of salvation; as well as from the article τὴν itself, as Bengel remarks, All *that* truth which I had now to tell you. Grotius, with equal correctness, says, The universality is to be restricted to that which is here concerned.[2] See in addition what we remarked before upon the *all* in ch. xiv. 26, and compare ch. xv. 15. The Holy Ghost will in this sense bring for the knowledge of salvation the *whole*, or, as de Wette[3] says, the *full* truth. But, strictly speaking, He will

[1] Bengel: The Scripture is not wont to say *truths*—a remark of immeasurable application to the error concealed in *our* way of speaking.

[2] The same restriction is in Mark v. 33, in the cited saying of Socrates, in Joseph. bell. jud. viii. 1, and generally in the nature of the case.

[3] Better than in his translation, where, in part wrongly, in part misunderstandingly, he says—lead you into the way to all truth.

Hosted by Google

not then first *bring* it; *the disciples* had already in a certain sense, with all the specific *reversion* here spoken of, the complete truth in the essentially perfect words of our Lord; the Holy Ghost was only to lead them *into* this truth, by opening their understanding, and giving to that understanding a complete and perfect system.

Many carry this too far when they regard the εἰς (with Lampe) as standing for ἐν simply,[1] and make the ὁδηγεῖν practically refer to the obedience of the truth, as elsewhere we have *walking in the* truth, or, according to such sayings as Ps. xxv. 5, cxliii. 10, cxix. 35. ("The truth of the Lord revealed in His word is considered as a *way to be trodden* by the Apostles and all the faithful.") Not so, but the perfecting of knowledge, the reversionary *saying* and *teaching* of what was not fully expressed by our Lord Himself, is here manifestly meant, as the connection with what precedes and what follows shows. But this teaching (and that is the truth in error of this exposition) is called a *leading*, because it must assuredly go hand in hand with the life and walk, because we must regard more as promised than merely, as Hess superficially explains, "the showing everything in the truest light"—or as the Vulg. briefly gives it—*Will teach you all the truth.* The living teaching of the Spirit is a guidance and leading into truth, in more senses than one. First, because it must assuredly presuppose, bring with it, require a constantly corresponding practical obedience, hence bringing no more to the inner and true understanding than the life is ripe for and fully willing to be guided by. Braune, "The Spirit will *lead*, the Christian must therefore *walk with* Him"—a saying of inexhaustible earnestness and force against all false appeal to the mere theoretical teaching of the Spirit. Then, the Spirit gives, as we see in the case of the Apostles, His solutions and explanations according to the need and the occasion (Matt. x. 19, 20)—just as in part at least the laws of Moses were given according to the emergencies which required them. "In the activity of his vocation a man attains the region of truth"—says Braune further. Thus while the *leading into* of itself indicates a *gradualness*, in opposition to the mechanical and childish notion that the Apostles at one bound were esta-

[1] Another reading, obviously to be rejected, has—ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάσῃ, followed by Nonnus.

Hosted by Google

blished in all truth on the day of Pentecost, we have to seek the reason and the measure of this gradualness both externally and internally; partly, in the internal ripening and progress of the Apostles themselves in their own holiness, with which their knowledge keeps pace—and partly in the stages of the way in which their vocation as witnesses led them through the world.

The *infallibility* of the Apostles, therefore, is not properly to be proved *from this passage*. For, at the outset, the same promise holds good for us all in its true meaning (1 Jno. ii. 27); and, further, this promise permits a progression of development. It is not true in itself that the Apostles never erred or went wrong in their common life; for, to every deficiency of holiness there corresponds in some sense a lack of knowledge, and every failure in perfect insight into the whole truth is of itself a relative, which easily brings about a positive, error. Thus, on the too generally adopted principle which carries back the "inspiration" of the *Scripture* to the persons of the writers and their life generally, we get no infallible Scripture. The Holy Spirit, however, who protected them from all error in their *office*, as was promised in ch. xv. 27, has actually given in the most specific *concentration of their official gift* a new *Scripture* as the conclusion of the old; and that *this Scripture* possesses the same infallibility (at least!) which Jesus incontrovertibly assigns to the Old Testament—is a truth which, though it is not to be proved by any dictum or dogma from without, *attests itself* ever more and more clearly, *bears witness* to its own claims against every new contradiction that arises, and to the sincere approves itself in all its plerophory down to its minutest letter.[1]

When the Lord promises that the Spirit should guide them into *the* truth, and ever more perfectly into the entire and full truth, He did indeed presuppose and imply that which we before

[1] But that a proper inspiration is expressed concerning the Old Testament only in such passages as 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16; 1 Pet. i. 19–22; 2 Pet. i. 19–21, this not being extended to the New Testament (Lutz, Bibl. Dogm. S. 429, as also that Rev. i. 19 places the revelation in the *seeing*, not in the *writing*)—is a marvellous assertion of a theology which is not based upon deep thinking, and is not altogether orthodox in faith. See on the other hand in Petersen Lehre v. d. Kirche i. 184 how and wherefore the Apostles, otherwise fallible, were infallible in *writing*.

Hosted by Google

rejected as His main meaning—that He would speak and teach nothing but truth, no lie. He *now* makes *this* prominent by a γάρ, which, however, does not strictly connect itself with the last word, but with the name *the Spirit of the truth*. There is a spirit of lying which blinds the world into unbelief, ruling it as its prince; the Spirit proceeding from the Father opposes Himself to this spirit—He can testify only the truth. Every other so-called "truth" will be opposed and condemned by Him as the lie of the liar from the beginning. Condescendingly, and at the same time convincingly, on account of this unhappily existing opposite, the Lord attributes to his Representative the same thing which He had so often asserted of Himself—the *not speaking of Himself*. Comp. ch. vii. 16–18, viii. 26, 28, xii. 49, 50, and what we have there said in explanation. In the same hypothetical and accommodating spirit, for the sake of distinction from the False in the world, as the Lord spoke there, it holds good here of the Holy Ghost. In a true sense the Spirit, like the Son, speaks assuredly from Himself, of His own, for the property of God in His three Hypostases is the truth; but in that evil sense of a *self* separate from God (the *impossibility* of which as it regards the Son and the Spirit must be maintained), He will not, and He cannot speak (ch. viii. 44). *He who* speaketh to us, and *that which* speaketh in us ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ—in the sense of Godless self and creaturely independence—leads us astray *from* the truth, comes from the liar, is a lie. Here it is important to distinguish and take heed before all things of what is called "spirit" in the world, or even in ourselves! "If the Holy Ghost may not speak of Himself, and out of Himself—O Preacher! how canst thou draw thy preaching out of thyself, out of thine head (or even *heart)?*" (Gossner.) Let nothing of thy preaching and testimony come from thine own mere impulse and will to know and to teach, before the Spirit hath taught and impelled thee![1]

But what He *shall hear* or *heareth:* similarly as the Son hath heard of the Father. But *here* we find not—*From the Father;* and we join *Kling's* protest against Lücke's simply so understanding it. "If we think of the Spirit as it were *by the side*

[1] "The true prophets are never *willing*-prophets." Berlenb. Bibel.

Hosted by Google

of the Son, hearing from the Father like the Son, the entire relation is disturbed, and the subordinate and incorrect standing-point of the Greek Church is entered upon at once." And this is expressly contradicted by vers. 14, 15, according to which the Spirit receives from the treasures of the Son, while all is again of the Father. Not therefore again,—of Me; but—What He will hear or heareth in the mutual counsel of the triune Godhead,[1] in the eternal converse between the Father and the Son, the Son and the Father, the revelation of which is first the word of the Son itself, the exposition of which then the same Spirit brings who hath received and searched into *all* which is God's, the *hidden things as well as the revealed* (הַנִּסְתָּרוֹת וְהַנִּגְלֹת, Deut. xxix. 28), the counsels of the Father as well as the testimonies of the Son, from all eternity. Mark the ὅσα ἂν for this all-embracing meaning, which at once leads to what follows! *Therefore* He already knoweth what will yet in the future be, and the Son hath not yet expressly told; therefore He will also foretell τὰ ἐρχόμενα.[2] In this extension of the words which point to what the Spirit hath heard, and will fore-announce, we must be careful of limiting the expression by an incorrect adherence to the thoughts which then gave rise to the declaration, and which it had immediately in view. Assuredly, the fact is involved that what the Spirit testifies as *true* will confirm and *evidence* its truth by *coming*:—the fulfilment of it will impress its final seal upon all His testimony. But *the things to come* with the definite article says more; it refers actually to the whole futurity, as of the individual so also of the church. Not only that through the power of the Spirit "every man may become his own prophet, and predict in his own consciousness what he has to expect in the future"[3]—not only that a certain prophesying of the future, with regard to our own life and

[1] Luther: "In the eternal Godhead, with Christ and the Father, where He seeth and knoweth all no other than it is." We would not assert, with Luthardt, that in this thoroughly trinitarian context neither the Father nor the Son is to be thought of, but only "God," in connection with the "hearing;" but his remark is more correct, that in ὅσα ἂν ἀκούσῃ is meant —What He from time to time will hear, as the emerging occasion requires.

[2] It is wrong to press the ἀνά in ἀναγγέλλειν, as if it meant—*Again* announce, expound what had been already said.

[3] As Herberger preaches in the Herz-Postille.

Hosted by Google

the times in which we live with their results, may be afforded by the Spirit when occasion may demand it. But the Lord, rather, promises here pre-eminently, as the fulfilment shows, that the Holy Ghost will, at the close of the Scripture which embraces the beginning and the end, yet more clearly and perfectly than ever before foretell the whole process of the kingdom of God to the end. Was not this a knowledge actually left in reversion by our Lord's words, which had intimated only the nearest and most distant facts of eschatology in the destination of Jerusalem and the final judgment? Did not the church need a decisive harmonising revelation concerning the relation of what had already come to pass in Christ to the great future which is predicted in the Old Testament prophets? And that is, after both St Peter and St Paul had paved the way by isolated utterances, the *Apocalypse* confided to St John. If this be regarded as unapostolical and spurious, we do not simply ask where would be the conclusion of the Bible, but where would be the worthy and perfect accomplishment of the word which St John has here in his Gospel recorded? We should have then to wait for a still further ἀναγγέλλειν τὰ ἐρχόμενα of the Holy Ghost! This indeed we may and ought to hope for, in as far as the announcements of the Holy Ghost were not absolutely closed with the apostolical age, in as far as the exposition and full accomplishment of His words go on to the end of the days. But in as far as a canonical foundation is laid through the Apostles for all instruction—as no man understanding anything of the system of God's kingdom and its Scripture can ever deny—such a close of the canon of prophecy was of itself to be presumed upon and expected. And now let him who hath ears to hear, hear what in Patmos *the Spirit* saith unto the churches through the bosom-disciple who was *in the Spirit* on the Lord's day! Let him see how here *the testimony of Jesus* Himself is fully completed as the *Spirit of prophecy*, and the mystery of God, as He announced it to His servants the prophets, appears in its final concentration—how *the Spirit* brings from the Lord, who is the Alpha and the Omega, a final "*I come quickly!*" and responds to His voice with the answering bride, "*Come, Lord Jesus!*" in the *Amen* which ratifies all! Assuredly, St John's Apocalypse is the most real fulfilment of the

Hosted by Google

word—The Spirit will show you things to come; and all further prophesying finds in it at least its text, even as all the teaching and testifying of the Spirit from the day of Pentecost downward has merely expounded what God from the beginning had already spoken in the Old and New Testaments through His Son, the Mediator and Angel of the covenant.

Ver. 14. The light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the πρόσωπον, the face and *person* of Jesus Christ (2 Cor. iv. 6), is the great and final end, beyond which no self-manifestation of the triune God is possible. The glorification of the Father in the personality of Him who already as the eternal Son was His countenance turned on the creature, and now as the Son of man in a most perfect personal expression of God has become its Restorer, is at the same time the glorification of Jesus Christ Himself—but this will be consummated before His disciples, and in them only by the Holy Ghost. He *shall glorify Me*—in this the Lord names the inmost centre of the whole truth, around which the periphery of its manifold development revolves; as also the most decisive test for every spirit of lying which would intrude into the place of the Holy Ghost, for all fanaticism as well as all Rationalism, all apocalypses and all dogmas and traditions which lead not to Christ and glorify not Him. "By this is decided in an anti-Montanist manner the question concerning the perfectibility of Christendom"—says Lücke excellently in few words. And Bengel with equal propriety from another point of view, concerning the Romish traditions: plus quam elementares sunt et nunc etiam *minus* ab iis, qui Paracletam habent, *ferri possunt.* Luther's critical canon, so often misunderstood by others and alas by himself, applied with too little insight sometimes, is perfectly correct *in thesi*—What preaches Jesus, and leads to faith in Him, is of the Holy Ghost. For as the Son speaketh of the Father and glorifieth the Father, even so speaketh the Holy Ghost of the Son and *glorifieth the Son.*[1]

[1] He glorifieth Him also in truth by an ever-increasing disclosure of His glory. Roos (Lehre J. Chr.) combines John xvii. 4 with this passage, and says, "We thus find nothing in the writings of the Apostles concerning the glory of the *Father* which had not previously occurred in the words of Jesus; but on the *glory of Jesus* the Apostles, under the illumination of

Hosted by Google

This is more clearly unfolded and established in the following word, by which the Lord perfectly closes the circle of the Holy Three-One, and places the revelation of the Spirit in its right relation to that which is the Father's and the Son's. For He will take *of that which is Mine* in what He will show—whence otherwise, being the Spirit of the Son as well as of the Father? That means, "not of the high things of the creation, of the many worlds of the universe," will He speak to you (as Oetinger says), but of the kingdom of God in Me and My redemption; the saving truth, whose centre I am, will He announce, and complete it by prophecy down to the last *things to come*. But this involves so strict a relation to the already spoken word, as well as to the yet reserved treasures of the Son, that no revelation of the Spirit going beyond this can be supposed possible. For, in the first place, the Spirit, as we heard in chap. xiv. 26, takes, makes prominent, and develops out of the words which Jesus had spoken, His own; so that nothing quite new, and which had not been expressed or intimated, is to come through Him.[1] But then, secondly, what new He brings, as far as it is new, comes from the reserved treasure of which ἔτι πόλλα ἔχω speaks. This is *also* the meaning, for otherwise there would be no foundation for what follows—All things that the Father hath are Mine. The Spirit, as we have already said, does not hear, as it were by the side of the Son, the Father alone; but all that He speaketh He hath heard also of the Son. The Son in His human nature hath inherited all, but this inheritance is His original eternal possession. This *all*, however, cannot by any means be said to

the *Comforter*, have taught much which Jesus in the days of His flesh never uttered concerning Himself; and to this belongs not merely the full exhibition of His Priestly and Kingly offices, but this also, that He is directly called God."—We leave this to be pondered, as far as it is true; but think that the glory of the Father also was still further illustrated, according to 2 Cor. iv. 6.

[1] It helps the unbelieving Christian world little, in their rejection of a development of testimony in the Apostles, to recur deceptively "to the original pure teaching of Christ;" the convincing Spirit makes their *conscience* find even in that teaching of Jesus the entire apostolical system, even as in this last the whole genuine "doctrine of the Church." And this will serve for the limitation and right adjustment of the previous quotation from Roos.

Hosted by Google

have been *explicitly* and literally communicated already in the words of our Lord down to His ascension, or in those of the Apostles in the beginning of the church; therefore as the Apostles in the freedom of the Spirit add new discourses to the Lord's discourses, so also the same Spirit leadeth us, in His application and exposition of them, into new testimonies and confessions of the church which are not always to be judged by and restricted to the apostolical *letter*.[1] Retaining, however, most assuredly the spirit of this letter, for on the other hand all the new lies *implicitly* in the old. That which the Holy Ghost may say, from His first coming to the end, is new as it respects the former word only by illustrating and glorifying *it*;[2] even as the Christ whom He preaches is in some sense another and yet no other, as it respects the "historical Christ" of the Gospels. To go back still further: All that the Lord spake in the flesh in such wise that it might afterwards be unfolded in the Spirit, was in its germ and principle contained in the Old Testament; for every word of God by the מַלְאָךְ of His face and the רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ is a word of Christ. "The full harmonious close of all the words of Jesus is Spirit; the testimony of Jesus is the kernel and spirit of all the prophets." (Oetinger.) To him who learns to understand this Christ is so glorified that he can set his seal to these words of Jesus, in which He can and must say concerning all *understanding of Scripture*—which includes again all testimony of the Spirit[3]—He will take *of Mine*. The Holy Ghost *testifies* of Jesus (ch. xv. 26)—that is the beginning of His office in the world; He *glorifieth* Jesus—that is the goal and end of His office in believers.

[1] Hence Luther's celebrated saying must be modified in consistency with this:—The devil easily would lead me astray, if I walk *out of Scripture-ground*.

[2] So that the church of these last ages may, having before it the entire history of the kingdom through which the Spirit had led it, more clearly and profoundly understand and more plainly express, than the original writers themselves, many things in the apostolical writings:—but the Spirit in the Apostles *meant* and *said* only this from the beginning. What caution is needed upon this subject see stated in the weighty note, S. 541–546, in Oetinger's Theosophie by Auberlen.

[3] See the Apocalypse, flowing almost entirely as it does from prophetic words! And if the Spirit does not always proceed, in His testimony of truth, directly from Scripture, He yet leads and directs us back infallibly into it.

Hosted by Google

It is obvious, finally, that as certainly as the leading into all truth is an internal teaching which carries the life and experience with it, the glorification of Christ *before us* must coincide with the appropriating establishment of His image *in us*;—although this is not specifically mentioned, but the discourse clings to the ἀναγγέλλειν. There is no other receiving of this glorifying light, no other living growing and becoming perfect in it, than that which takes place according to 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18.

Ver. 15. The honour of the *Father* could not be left without its positive expression: we have found this pervading all these farewell discourses, but the Trinitarian expression and winding up of all culminates in this passage. From that earliest, "What seek ye? Come and see!" to the first disciples—from the following more penetratingly questioning and more plainly offering testimonies to Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman (to the man of knowledge—the mysteries of regeneration and His exaltation on the cross, the grounds of judgment; to the ignorant woman—the true gift of God for her sin, the true prayer)—through testimonies, ever rising higher and yet ever condescending lower, to the dignity, power, and honour of the *Son*, in whom alone is the *sinner's* salvation—by all these has the selection of our Lord's discourses in St John's Gospel paved the way for these last-spoken words in the narrow circle of the disciples, words which, as we have seen, become more and more *apocalyptical* for the future explanation of the Spirit, when He should *come* and again speak of *Him who was still to come*. Assuredly, as has been often admitted, and more often felt without admitting, not till the church of the last time will this pre-Apocalypse be altogether explained and glorified in the light of the Spirit.[1] Meanwhile, all who honestly hang on the Lord as living branches feed upon it with still increasing knowledge; for the deep and inexhaustible things are clothed in the plainest simplest words, inviting us as if they were perfectly revealed. So is it also with the doctrine of the Triunity of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, which runs through these

[1] Generally, the whole Gospel of St John, which we elsewhere called "the higher and highest Apocalypse," corresponds, in its mystical depths for knowledge and life combined, to the last perfect development of the church.

Hosted by Google

chapters; in which the Spirit appears with more and more personal characteristics, and at the same time the unity of the Three is more and more firmly established as the close comes. Simple faith finds here already the whole truth; the doctrinal investigation of the church finds here its firmest *dicta probantia*, its surest limitations within which it may range, as also its not yet attained goal.

Glorify *Me*, take of *Mine*—to this belongs necessarily, again, All things that *the Father* hath are *Mine!* See ch. xvii. 10, where this last and highest word, which it could become the glorified Son alone to say, is found by the side of—All Mine are Thine! Here belongs Col. ii. 2, 3. When the Lord now rises from the announcement of an economical impartation, ver. 14, to the eternal foundation of all in the interior, essential, eternally trinitarian relationship, He does *not* repeat (as might have been expected, and has therefore been read) the previous λήψεται, but substitutes for it a λαμβάνει, in strict parallel with ὅσα ἔχει and ἐμά ἐστι. Thus there is opened to us a glimpse into the living blessed bond of love in receiving and giving in the eternal ground of the triune essence of the Godhead. The Father hath from eternity given to the Son to have life and all things in Himself, yet only as He is the Son who revealeth the Father, only as the Fatherhood remaineth with the Father. But all things the Son bringeth and giveth to the Father again, honoureth and glorifieth Him in His being glorified in His people. And this through the *Spirit*, who with equal rights in this unity, *taketh* from the sole fulness of the Father and the Son, all that He livingly offers in His announcement—in order finally, in the consummate glorification and unity of love, to bring back the redeemed church through the Son to the Father; as is afterwards (ch. xvii.) *in the Spirit*, therefore without naming the Spirit, declared in prophetic prayer. Although then the recurring διὰ τοῦτο εἶπον—ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν leads back the discourse into the economical λήψεται, yet it is grounded upon the relation of essence which was indicated in the λαμβάνει: the Spirit who proceedeth from the Father, proceedeth as truly and essentially, since the Father and the Son are one, from the Son also. Hence Luther expounds, as if he read λαμβάνει: "He taketh *His own*, that is"

Hosted by Google

—not merely what He testifies and imparts in the church, but, because He indeed gives Himself, mediates the indwelling of God (ch. xiv. 23)—"the Divine nature in eternity not only from the Father, but also from Christ; and thus there abideth one eternal essence or Divinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, but in distinctive persons"—which *Persons*, as we must speak of them humanly, as the *complement* to the *πρόσωπον* of Christ, are again incontrovertibly designated by *ἔχει, ἐμά, λαμβάνει*. Luther, once more, "This is the circle round and complete; all Three, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in one eternal Divine nature:—thus the Holy Ghost is Himself true God, without any difference, only that He hath it both from the Father and the Son."

THE WAY OF THE FIRST DISCIPLES, AS TYPICAL FOR ALL FUTURITY, THROUGH SORROW TO JOY; THE JOY OF BIRTH; THE PERFECT JOY OF SEEING HIM AGAIN IN THAT DAY.

(Ch. xvi. 16–24.)

Thus has the Lord, after so condescending a commencement with lower themes, risen as He always does to speak of high, yea of the highest mysteries: or, what is the same thing, He has penetrated into the depths of God, where the Spirit heareth, and whence He taketh the things which are the Father's and the Son's, in order to announce and to bring them to the church. And He has herein once more anticipated the distant future, reached forward to the great conclusion of all the truth, and the perfect revelation, when *all things* that the Father hath, and which are likewise the Son's, shall be proclaimed, taught, predicted, and confirmed in their fulfilment. The disciples *hear* indeed what Jesus speaks, but they *apprehend* it not. This He also well knows, and yet He must speak it. But after He has done justice to the preparatory testimony which was necessarily given concerning the work, office, and person of the Holy Ghost (vers. 14, 15, is the proper final close of *this* testimony)—He can as it were stoop once more to the weakness of the disciples' present condition. He therefore now begins anew to

Hosted by Google

speak to their terrified hearts concerning that which *first of all* and *immediately* should result from and after His departure to the Father. This also, indeed, must partake of the spirit of His recent words, and be immediately glorified into a type of the way and the future of all His disciples;—and soon His word in vers. 22–24 has again reached forward even to the full glory and joy of *that day*, which only *dawns* in the new birth of His resurrection, but will be consummate in another, the final return.—What a transition, or rather what a return back, between vers. 15 and 16; from the depths of the triune essence of the Godhead to the immediately near present of His disciples' destiny, to the great change of the now impending day! There is, as for Himself the breaking through death into life, so for the disciples a deeply penetrating, fundamental *change from sorrow to joy*. By no means merely their sorrow at His death, and their joy in His living again, after the analogy of the sorrow and joy of the children of men in their changing experience; but as the mediating expression of an essential internal process which the Holy Ghost completed in their own case, and which still goes on to the end of all. Thus as this *way of the disciples through sorrow to joy* between the cross and the resurrection of our Lord was already for themselves something preparatory and typical, it becomes to us a type of the way which *all His future disciples* have also to pass through, all those who are to be won through the conviction of the Spirit out of the unbelieving world;—a way through that godly sorrow which at first distinguishes them fully from the world, into the joy of faith and life in the Holy Ghost. That which the μικρόν and πάλιν μικρόν of the departure of Jesus embraces during the few days of the Apostles' waiting is a prophetic mirror for the course of the whole church, for the great interval from His going away till His return in a wider sense. Let this be taken preliminarily for the general indication of the sense from ver. 16 to ver. 24; in which section vers. 16–21 treat of the *sorrow* (necessary to the birth which is here in question), and then immediately vers. 22–24 of that certainly following, increasing, and finally consummate *joy*.

Ver. 16. The Lord had spoken similarly in ch. vii. 33 to the Jews, in ch. xiii. 33, and more directly ch. xiv. 19, to the dis-

Hosted by Google

ciples—but now first does He bring it closely home to them. The word and the thoughts, at least in the *first two* clauses (the bond of connection of the third introduces a difficulty), appear *to us* now very simple and plain; but the longer we pause before the word the more cause do we find to *ask*, even as expositors, What is it that He saith? Ch. xiv. 19 is however distinguished from the present words, in that here not merely are *the disciples* included as for a while, like the world, *not* seeing Him (this was there also hinted); but the *seeing again*, which is promised to them, is connected also with a gracious πάλιν μικρόν, coming very near.[1] This of itself is enough to prove that the ancients were not absolutely wrong when they referred the clause to the Lord's *resurrection;* this is incontrovertibly the most immediate meaning of the letter of the contrast between ὄψεσθε and οὐ θεωρεῖτε (if the one removes the bodily visibility, the other gives it back again). The plain parallel in ch. xiv. 19 proves the same, as also ver. 22 of this chapter, where it is impossible to dissever the resurrection from ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς. Olshausen is therefore incorrect in saying, "All the better expositors are now agreed that a reference to the bodily resurrection is not here the *direct* acceptation;" while he (in company with *almost* all modern interpreters, headed by Luther and Calvin) interprets the promise as referring *only* to an internal spiritual seeing. It would be better to say that the sight of the Lord returning in the resurrection is the *first* meaning;[2] and to admit that the ancients in *going no further* were wrong also on their part. The error on both sides is no other than a forgetfulness of the *typical-prophe-*

[1] That μικρόν points *in both cases* to an interval needs no proof, on account of the πάλιν. The translation is false, therefore, which gives, And then shall ye *for a while*, a little time, see Me (as if κατὰ μικρόν)—*for* I go (presently *again*) My way to the Father!

[2] Luthardt does me some justice here: "That the return of Christ to His church is in a manner promised; the disciples are referred to the transitory return of their Lord and their brief communion with Him, as a pledge of His future return." In fact, it may well be so, for the letter speaks undeniably of the resurrection. But we assert something more and different from this: The Lord does not speak of a *transitory* communion as the type of that which was only *future*, as if between the two intervened a long separation and orphanhood, but of the real beginning of an *abiding* fellowship and union through the Spirit.

Hosted by Google

tical perspective, which is so habitually left out of view. This we must persist in re-asserting, and point to it as the alone satisfactory hermeneutical principle for the solution of these last predictions of Jesus, just as we had reason to do upon Matt. xxiv. The prophetic word receives its first full fulfilment in the future of the Spirit, according to its spiritual and most essential meaning; but it *connects itself in its expression* with the typical event which presents the more immediate future as already present. B.-Crusius is in the right direction, "As ver. 20 seq. speak of that sensible re-appearance, this may be the meaning already in our passage." As, for the unbelieving world, the *seeing* of the Judge coming in the clouds, according to ch. xxvi. 64, *begins* with the first announcement of His victory over death and of His justification, but then reaches onward to the last day —just so the seeing of the Lord, which is known by faith, in the light and by the glorification of the Spirit, actually begins in the case of the disciples on the morning of the resurrection and goes on through the ascension and pentecost. The *day of life, of the Spirit* which was suddenly to follow upon the suddenly darkening night of death, and which the Lord promises as the time of a seeing no longer to cease, extends in its grand all-comprehending aspect from the resurrection-morning to—the full consummation of every individual, as of the whole church. The return of the Lord, of which ver. 22 ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς is spoken, has its great commencement in the resurrection, but is not fulfilled in its last and deepest sense until that return which was already spoken of in ch. xiv. 3[1]—thus in His taking to Himself (as we there expounded) the individual, and in His parousia at the end for the entire church.[2] So far is Augustin not altogether wrong, when he referred it to this last and proper return after His departure to the Father. But all these critical points must be embraced in one, if we would extract from the meaning of the Lord's word to the first disciples the meaning which it contained *for us all*.

Bengel thinks that ὄπτειν, as compared with θεωρεῖν, has a

[1] Which Klee perceives, but exhibits it in a one-sided and ungrounded manner.

[2] Compare the correct exposition in Göschel, in his doctrine of the last things (Berlin 1850).

Hosted by Google

meaning *magis cum affectu*, and would make this an argument for a spiritual beholding, with joy and clear apprehension; but when we regard the words rigorously, their θεωρεῖν would rather (as in earlier passages) be the spiritual beholding, ὄπτειν on the other hand (as is plain in ver. 22) the physical seeing. We hold the truth to be that the *not seeing* and *seeing* in both cases is to be understood first as bodily, using this as the expression for the subsequent reference to spiritual seeing. While the disciples saw not Jesus, their faith in Him, their seeing Him as the Son of God, was obscured and almost taken away.

The whole *passion*, the full deep *suffering of death*, in which, even for Himself, such immeasurable elements of woe conspired, is contemplated by the Lord as a brief transition, and He passes joyfully over it by His πάλιν μικρόν. *For* in that and after that He dies, He goeth only *to the Father*, to His own glorification, see ch. xiv. 28. This of itself somewhat explains the striking clause with ὅτι,[1] which has its difficulty still when more closely examined, and concerning which Tholuck too boldly says, "This ὅτι would be perfectly unintelligible if the Lord spoke of *bodily* seeing." Certainly, if of this *alone;* but our exposition knows better. V. Gerlach more cautiously and correctly remarks, "The difficulty for the disciples lay in this *because* of the going away, and *therefore* of the seeing; if they had apprehended all which went before, they would have presently found the solution of this new word also, which ceased to be a mystery after all that had passed." Had not the Lord opened His whole discourse (ch. xiv. 3) with "going away *and coming again?*" Did not this coming again occur to them most plainly in the ὄψεσθέ με? But this being plain, and giving them the clue to His meaning, should not the ὅτι ὑπάγω come in before as belonging only to the οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με? So Pfenninger (whose zeal for making everything plain and square often leads his otherwise keen insight astray) interposes arbitrarily—"for *in the interval* I go to the Father!" (Against which ch. xx. 17 is to be observed.) The Lord designedly did not thus set forth His παροιμία, His enigmatical word; the going to the Father is made the foundation of the entire double clause, indeed, taking into

[1] Its absence in many Codd. is certainly an omission, as ver. 17 shows. Tischendorff very improperly leaves out these words.

Hosted by Google

account the nearer connection and the *predominant tone of promise* which falls on the πάλιν, especially of the seeing again and the return. Though from the *going away*, the not seeing seems immediately to follow, but this only presses the paradox into the deeper thought which was prepared for in ch. xiv. 28:—My departure *to the Father* leads Me to honour and glory, by means of which I can reveal Myself to you after, and in consequence of, My death. (Braune excellently puts it, "He is not withdrawn into the *realm of shades* from which *no return* is possible, but to the glory of the Father, whence He can continually and for ever reveal Himself to His own.") Still more explicitly, after all this: My death and departure to God is that of the High Priest, for redemption, the opening of heaven, the preparing your place, the obtaining the Spirit—and from this would arise to their minds the deeper view, that He would not give Himself *permanently* to be seen in the body, but *in the higher manner of the Spirit* continue it, a final visible manifestation being the final and glorious necessary consequence of all. But what is said is spoken in obscure intimation, Ye shall *see* not merely My victory over the power of death, which cannot hold Me, and through this My return from the grave, but ye shall go on to see soon (all a πάλιν μικρόν) My ascension to the Father also, ye shall see Me in this My way, and be altogether satisfied with My departing and yet remaining. One is almost tempted to translate, Ye shall see Me, *that* or *how*, forsooth, I go to the Father—but this would be improper as being contrary to the arrangement of the sentence, which, like every stimulating enigma-word, must be as simple in its expression as profound in its meaning.

Not all the disciples inquire and seek in express words the meaning of what had been said; there are some who do, but St John does not name them, any more than he names himself—assuredly one among those who pondered *in silence*, and probably having some slight understanding. They are not sufficiently bold, even after the encouragement of ver. 5, to ask the Master Himself, for they have also to reflect upon the constant allusion to a future understanding. But as they surround Him, speaking about His words half aloud, they gradually take time and get more courage. The *words* they understand and retain

Hosted by Google

well, so that they can literally repeat them; but they do not apprehend their meaning, therefore twice, *What is this that He saith?* First, the twofold prediction, and the strange reason assigned for both; then, spelling it out, they take it to pieces (Bengel, They disjoin the two conjunct words), hence the καὶ ὅτι, and that with a strengthening ἐγώ.[1] Thus do they confuse themselves over the mystery, without asking Him as the Jews did, ch. vii. 36. It was natural that the most startling word, that which finally obtruded itself upon them, would be the μικρόν; and at last they limit themselves to this, with a previous τοῦτο, indicating that they embraced all in this one word. *So near* was the great turning-point to be, the sorrow and joy, the seeing and not seeing of which they cannot understand, *because* it is stated to be near! The result is, *We know not what He saith*—in which they unconsciously utter a general confession applicable to *all* His discourses. The apparently diffuse and prolix style of description here is notwithstanding perfectly precise in its distinctive shades of expression, down to the slightest turn.[2] The εἶπον οὖν and ἔλεγον οὖν (even with the καί between), do not indicate, as Lampe thinks, different words of different parties; but the same *some of His disciples* is the subject, though they are speaking to *one another*. They are not able at once to ask, but they revolve the question and His word in their thoughts; and their οὐκ οἴδαμεν passes finally into that which Jesus remarks, encourages, and anticipatingly responds to before it is uttered—Now *we will* ask *Him* instead of one another!"

Ver. 19. "Christ repeats to them the words once more *which St John also recites*, because they contain matter of permanent thought and embarrassment to His people." So does the Berlenb. Bibel hit the true emphasis of the seven times recurring "little while"—the title given to the *Jubilate* between Easter and Pentecost, and which gives the profound reason of the true *jubilate* which should spring in a little while from the *plorabitis et flebitis*. St John tells us that they *desired* to ask Him, only that he may show us that Jesus *marked* it. But Jesus, humbling them, and yet humbling Himself to their thoughts, first

[1] Which may be genuine the second time, in the repetition.

[2] Thus we see no reason for changing the Text. Rec. to suit Rinck's lucubrations.

Hosted by Google

touches their *inquiring among themselves;* and then once more declares to them, in prophecy still, what He had before said (but without the *I go away*);—thus seeming to say, Do ye contend about these plain words? But He then goes on to take them for the text of a yet more plain and penetrating prospective explanation of the *experience which should presently befall the disciples.*

Ver. 20. He designedly omits the *going to the Father*, as this would have required Him once more to lament over or reprove them for their not understanding it. But the *not* seeing and *yet* seeing *again* He now describes still more plainly by its *effects*, or rather by the position in which it will place the disciples; and His *Amen, Amen*, is the preface of a plain declaration how it will be with their souls. *Ye shall weep and lament*—Ye shall mourn over Me as dead! Ye shall see Me go as by a fearful dying into death! This κλαύσετε καὶ θρηνήσατε is more than the only similar πενθεῖν καὶ κλαίειν of Mark xvi. 10. For the words run just like the ordinary *wailing for the dead*, concerning which θρηνεῖν (Luke xxiii. 27, vii. 32), and θρῆνος (Matt. ii. 18; 2 Sam. i. 17; Jer. ix. 17), in particular were used. This of itself was dreadful enough for the poor disciples—Lamentation of death over the Son of the living God, their sole unfailing Comforter! But now to deepen it follows the joy of the world, not for the sake of referring to the world—which would be inappropriate here—but to intensify the word for the disciples. No man will comfort you or sympathise with your sorrows; rather will the whole of the rest of the world around you rejoice over that which is your sorrow, and laugh at and mock you. They will rejoice that they are rid of Me, as they will imagine, Ps. xxii. 18, xli. 9. They will institute a new Purim feast, days of prosperity and joy, in which to congratulate one another with gifts, as if Haman the Jews' enemy hung on the cross. This rejoicing of the world is the keenest sword to weakness and unbelief, as well as to the true dependence of the sorrowful disciples trusting in God. (Ps. xlii. 11.) Once more the Lord condenses, for the ὑμεῖς thus set in opposition to the κόσμος, all into one deep Λυπηθήσεσθε,[1]

[1] We must not read ὑμεῖς δέ, for the antithesis does not any longer point backward, but forward in the ἀλλά.

Hosted by Google

concerning which B.-Crusius says with right feeling, "λυπεῖσθαι is still more than the θρηνεῖν and κλαίειν." But *now* the seeing again and the *joy!* By a *saying* (ἐν παροιμίαις) very common in ordinary human life and in Scripture the Lord describes the change and transition which should in their case take place in a peculiar and incomparable sense. As it is written in Esth. ix. 22, concerning the ungodly, revengeful joy of the saved Jews,[1] which nevertheless was a feeble type of a better joy,—נֶהְפַּךְ לָהֶם מְיָגוֹן לְשִׂמְחָה וּמֵאֵבֶל לְיוֹם טוֹב (Sept. ἐστράφη αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ πένθους εἰς χαράν)—just so does the Lord here speak, probably not without an echo of this well-known formula, which would then contain a secret ironical allusion to the *reversal* of the false Israelites' Purim. If such a reference seems too farfetched or inappropriate, we find the saying concerning the conversion of sorrow into joy often enough recurring in all kinds of forms, as in Ps. xxx. 12 (com. Job xxx. 31), and see particularly Jer. xxxi. 13. The expression here is heightened to the utmost, however, since the sorrow is *itself* to *become* joy; it is not merely to be lost in or exchanged for joy, but the subject and ground of the sorrow becomes the subject and ground of the joy. This is here true in an abounding sense: the cross of our Lord is glorified into an eternal consolation; *out of* the sorrow at the cross and the sepulchre, because in it there was the believing and loving seeking of the Crucified, *is born* their joy in the Living, Risen One, who goes before into the heavens. The same holds good as a universal promise to all sorrow which is not sorrow of the world, but λύπη κατὰ θεόν—which can no longer rejoice where the world exults. Those who weep bear already the precious seed which rises again into sheaves of joy —"on the flood of tears we float out of ruin"—suffering was to the disciples as to their Lord the necessary and afterwards thankfully acknowledged passage to bliss.

Christians, as we shall hereafter more definitely show, may hope for an ever new repetition of this change. When the world is in sorrow it still has a hope that sorrow will be turned

[1] It is to intimate this that Mordecai, led by the Holy Ghost, throughout the whole of this book which shows us Israel at the lowest depth in which it was recognised and even defended as the people of God—suppresses the *name of God* and the word *prayer*.

Hosted by Google

again into joy, and externally and for a while its hope is often fulfilled; but all the more certainly will the final separation take place at the last. The Lord does not *here* expressly say that all the joy of the world must finally be turned into woe, because that *at present* does not conduce either to His own or His people's joy, and because He would avoid every appearance of a reciprocation of gladness in the world's righteous condemnation.[1] But this was also to be understood: see Lu. vi. 25.

Ver. 21. The definite ἡ γυνή begins once more in a proverbial, figurative tone, and sets clearly before us the similitude to be explained afterwards. No accusative was wanted with the ὅταν τίκτῃ, for τίκτειν stands absolutely for ὠδίνειν or κύειν, as frequently appears. And so we find γεννᾷν as here used of the mother (Gal. iv. 24; Matt. i. 25, ii. 1), although not often, and for the most part not without a special emphasis which expresses rather the perfected bringing forth of that which was already begotten, than the simple bearing in itself. What would be the father's begetting if the mother did not bring forth and give full birth to the offspring? Hers is thus the decisive labour of sorrow therein! Augustine would take τὸ παιδίον (on account of his mystical meaning) for the *male child;* but without any reason, for it is quite general and almost the same as γέννημα, אֵם יֹלֶדֶת אֶת־הַיֶּלֶד. But the little child, however, is already *a man*, complete for future growth, as the common note of mothers' joy runs—"The blessed God hath forgotten nothing in him."[2] That a sinful *man* is born into this temporal, miserable, perverted *world*—alas, that in itself says but little; without the grace of God coming to nature's help all mothers' joy is but vain, and may be the ground of future woes, as in Eve's yet ignorant קָנִיתִי אִישׁ. Nevertheless, in the symbolical domain of nature, this joy has for the first its full propriety;

[1] There is nevertheless a pure joy which the perfectly just may feel in the righteous judgment of God, and which must not be called rejoicing in evil! (2 Thess. i. 6; Rev. xviii. 20.) Which meaning of the *Spirit* in the typical Old Testament (*e.g.* Ps. cxxxvii.) must be carefully distinguished from the human joy which might be connected with it. There may be in heaven a most glorious realisation of the true *Purim joy*, in the name of the Lord.

[2] In this mother-joy in the birth of a "man child," Braune sees still more, "The woman has the deepest and most living interest in—*humanity*.' (Our Age and its Mission, Leipzic 1850.)

Hosted by Google

God has wisely and graciously so ordered it, for the compensation of pangs and the continuance of the human race, that the mother presently *remembereth no more the anguish*, and therefore fearlessly hath her desire towards her husband still. Gen. iii. 16, אֶל־אִישֵׁךְ תְּשׁוּקָתֵךְ—whence immediately follows his lordship.

But all this, since the Fall which introduced it, is only a symbolical *prophecy*, written in nature by the finger of God, of the new birth of the true, restored man, as we have already seen in ch. iii.; no man doubts that here also the Lord speaks ἐν παροιμίᾳ, although the current interpretation of the words exhibits all variations of depth. The immediate and sudden *transition* from the greatest anguish to the most compensative joy, as in the case of the mother when she hath borne her child, and further the necessity of these woes, and their being in the fruit of them themselves turned to joy,—is a type of the corresponding spiritual process which admits of comparison with no other in the whole domain of nature. The first and fundamental *tertium comparationis*, therefore, lies in the simple word—*Your sorrow shall be turned into joy*. Further, in the spiritual fulfilment of this the same man is even both in one person,—the bearing mother and the child borne. In the Old Testament not only are the pangs of birth a frequent figure of the greatest anguish and distress generally (כְּיוֹלֵדָה), but the similitude often presses onward into its spiritual interpretation. See Micah iv. 9, 10; Hos. xiii. 13, in the right translation and exposition; but especially the remarkable passages Is. lxvi. 7, 8 and xxvi. 17–19, into the deep meaning of which we cannot permit ourselves now to enter, but leave it to the investigation of the thoughtful reader.

Who is then the bearing one, to whom Jesus here promises joy after and out of anguish? Manifestly, in the first place, as in ver. 20 before and ver. 22 afterward it is declared—His disciples. How and when were they so troubled? (Lu. xxiv. 17.) How did the resurrection tidings astound them as they mourned and wept! (Mark xvi. 10.) And was not this sorrow concerning Christ, this passion-sympathy, actually *to them* first of all the anguish of the new birth, a divine sorrow on account of sin? We may say that what was wanting in these first disciples to the full deep penitence which must precede the reception of the

Hosted by Google

whole grace of Christ, was experienced now first in its depth during these days. In their ears also sounded the word, piercing their heart and conscience, which the Sufferer cried—Weep not for Me but for yourselves! Under the cross of their Lord they learned to *sorrow for sin*, as they had never been taught before, with full understanding and feeling:—the joy of the world showed them what the world was, and delivered them from all the dreams of a Messiah's kingdom in this world; this drove them back into the depths of their own hearts, where they found the root and essence of the same sin, and in the entire obscuration of all else it was to them as if they were themselves no better than the world, unworthy of their heavenly Friend; as if the triumphant power of sin in them had put an end to all which their faith had hitherto apprehended and hoped for. They *saw* Him no more, not even in the light of faith in remembrance! All their previous *unbelief* must become manifest to them as condensed into one whole, their *weakness* must sink into impotence and despondency. They saw and they tasted with Christ, as far as in them lay, *the sin of the world*, and they, moreover, *their own sin* in it—they were *almost* reduced to become conscious only of *sin*, without a propitiation or redemption.[1] This way from sorrow to joy was to the first disciples as the pangs of birth for the outburst of resurrection-gladness; and their way, as we shall see more plainly soon, shadowed out our way to the same result. None of us appropriates, in true personal experience, the joy of Easter and Pentecost until the passion-sorrow has first prepared the way.

But let us now penetrate still more deeply. What was all the suffering of the disciples but a fellowship with the sufferings of their Lord? Did not He first, in the deepest reality, feel in Himself that anguish on account of sin, did He not experience all the throes and pangs of death that He might, by suffering, bring forth life? He Himself in such reality that His disciples, to the end of their days, and of all time, might enter more and more fully into the fellowship of this suffering unto their full

[1] "As if there were upon earth only sinners who godlessly mocked in their sin, and sinners who wept helplessly beneath it." The author unfolded all the thoughts of this passage in the third of Zwanzig biblische Predigten, Kempten bei Dannheimer, 1832.

Hosted by Google

consummate birth into life? He who does not at last refer ver. 21 to *Christ Himself* has not yet extracted the whole meaning of the word. Thus not merely (as Dräseke says), "*With you* it will be as with a mother;" although Fikenscher truly observes that "Jesus would apply the similitude of the labouring mother only to His disciples." His express words of interpretation, that is, speak only of them; but this interpretation itself is not otherwise to be understood than as we first penetrate to the ground of the matter, and perceive how Christ in His person endures the regeneration-pangs of entire humanity. *Cross* and *new-birth* are closely connected in one, as was shown to Nicodemus at the beginning; if for us the second comes out of the first by means of the crucifying with Him of our old man, so must the Son of man, who draws us into this fellowship, Himself first have entered into a real fellowship with this old man—though without sin of His own. An intimation *of this* is already found in the fact that our Lord says here with the same emphasis—her *hour is come*—as He previously had said concerning His own sufferings; but it more certainly approves itself by a right understanding of the great matter itself.[1] The death of Christ was "the sore birth-act of entire humanity" (as Olshausen expresses himself), for humanity was in Him not merely represented *in effigie*, but essentially comprised in Him. The Messiah, suffering and scorned, bears the peoples all in His bosom,—thus is Ps. lxxxix. 50 rightly interpreted and expounded;[2] this is the seed which He has, the fruit which He bears, the עַם נוֹלָד to which the righteousness shall be declared which He hath accomplished. (Ps. xxii. 30, 31.) That which in Him is flesh of our flesh, infirmity derived from Adam's fall, becomes the vessel and instrument of redeeming sensibility to sin and experience of death, by which comes in the first breaker-through, the *great birth* of the new *man* in His person, which may be regarded as the fully born Son of God

[1] And this we would desire for Luthardt, who has adventured somewhat too early on St John's Gospel. Forgetting his earlier admission, he makes the Lord here again speak for the time beyond the death and resurrection—literally and alone concerning the new birth of the glorified church at His coming! This is exegesis which condemns itself by its utter inappropriateness for the pulpit, contradicting the Spirit who preaches in the church.

[2] See my Psalmenkommentar, which establishes this *grammatically*.

Hosted by Google

in humanity, as well as the more than reinstated heavenly man glorified in the Godhead. (1 Cor. xv. 47, 48.) Chrysostom, bordering on this mystery, refers our saying to the *ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου*, Acts ii. 24, in which we must be on our guard against finding, with the superficial, an error of the Sept. for "bands." The חֶבְלֵי שְׁאוֹל, Ps. xviii. 5, the sorrow of hades, Christ has already anticipated upon the cross, so that He comes to the place, where, indeed, many will yet be born to Him, as already the living Forerunner and Conqueror.[1] In this great process of birth in death, the real prototype of the regeneration of every child of Adam which is thus made possible, He is Himself the labouring mother; but we may and we must more precisely say that the *mother* of all birth and new-birth is *the Spirit*, who at the beginning of the new-creation out of the first ruin, of light out of the darkness, wrought brooding upon the waters (Gen. i. 2 מְרַחֶפֶת),[2] who now as *πνεῦμα αἰώνιον* (Heb. ix. 14) overcomes the flesh, rends the veil of death in order to the breaking through of the God-man, previously prepared for in humanity, but now made perfect; who since then as the Spirit of the church brings to their full issue all the further pangs which produce the brethren of the First-born. Here we can speak only in the language of Theosophists and Mystics; and common theology is impatient of this, and turns away from it.

Ver. 22. The *three stages* in the experience of the disciples, which are here brought into one perspective of prophecy and yet plainly distinguished, have been brought into prominence by Beck,[3] with his wonted depth of insight into Scripture. "One feast followed another after the passion, in which *they had sorrow:* at the resurrection He *saw them again*, but (*we* would add) *they saw not Him yet* in full clearness, they had not their full joy through fear of the Jews; first at the ascension, when they saw Him go to the Father (*βλεπόντων αὐτῶν*, Acts i. 9), *their hearts rejoiced;* but this also would have vanished as a

[1] See my Reden der Apostel i. 42, and the Psalmenkom., where the whole difficulty of the distinction between חֶבְלֵי from חֶבֶל and חַבְלֵי from חֶבֶל is fully entered into.

[2] Basil. lib. 2 Hexam. *ἀνέθαλπε καὶ ζωογόνει τὴν τῶν ὑδάτων φύσιν κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς ἐπωαζούσης ὄρνιθος*; comp. Deut. xxxii. 11.

[3] Christl. Reden ii. Band S. 63 ff.

Hosted by Google

beautiful dream if the Comforter had not assured them at the pentecost that *no man should take from them their joy*. Here also we see why now ὄψομαι stands instead of ὄψεσθε, for not only does all spring from His return in the resurrection, but *their* seeing and *beholding* will be first consummated in the Spirit as the consequence of that. That their *heart* should rejoice—is the echo of Old Testament words, as in Ps. xxii. 27 the pregnant יְחִי לְבַבְכֶם לָעַד—and still more plainly Is. lxvi. 14, καὶ ὄψεσθε, καὶ χαρήσεται ἡ καρδία ὑμῶν. This last parallel teaches us at once two things: that the last fulfilment of this promise reaches forward to the end of the church's victory, and that this joy of heart is the contrast of the world's joy turned into mourning. (Is. lxv. 13, 14.) Yes, indeed, this is a joy against which (even now) the *laughter* of the world is a *howling!*" Did the world rejoice around the cross of Christ according to ver. 20, in any such sense that their *heart* actually was glad? That could not have been, nor can it be so ever. The joy of the world is no deeper than the skin; it is a sickly spasmodic tumult in the flesh, against the feeling of the heart and the testimony of the conscience. "They laugh—but anguish is in their hearts!" It is only *because* they enter not into their hearts that they can for a while enjoy a forced satisfaction. The world which, with or without Christ, would evade the thought of sin and death, the deepest ground of all sorrow, can secure its joy only by the dissipation of its inmost nature, and by becoming deaf to its voice. Therefore its joy is *loud*, while yet silent joy is alone genuine and profound. When its gladness and mockery become silent around Golgotha, nothing remains but that all the people smite upon their breasts. The world needs *something from without* for its joy, because it has not its source within, no child of this world can rejoice alone with his God; but the children of God through Christ seek it in their hearts, and in their hearts they have salvation, their true joy. The world is satisfied without satisfaction—We lose not the hearts' peace in the midst of all the tribulation which may befall. The world misunderstands and perverts the word of Ecclus. xxx. 22–25, which the pious man intended not indeed in the sense of Wisd. ii. 6–9, but yet, being without the Spirit of inspiration, has expressed in a way easily misunderstood—It

Hosted by Google

fears and drives from it sorrow, as death! But believers understand better, according to 2 Cor. vii. 10, and resign themselves willingly to that wholesome tribulation which only increases their joy.

And still the Lord's last words are true to them—*Their* joy no man taketh away! (Mark the hint that it is otherwise with the world.) The root and principle and strength of their joy cannot be touched, however afflictions may come; for 2 Cor. i. 5 holds eternally true, and suffering with Christ *becomes* itself ever increasing consolation and joy. As long as the disciples are in the world, they do indeed need a preservation from evil; for there is danger ever present of their joy being taken away. But if they do not *themselves* fall from it and destroy their own peace, *no man* else, not the world and its princes can rob them of their once-received joy. (Just as chap. x. 28 was expounded.) The present *αἴρει*, once more,[1] has great emphasis, it embraces the whole time to come, but means finally the goal of consummate security, 1 Pet. i. 7–9. Thus the entire promise, in as far as it includes not merely the whole future life of these first disciples but the whole succession of future disciples, *extends very far*, actually even to the end of the days. This is the truth of the exposition which would be prematurely eschatological. And here we plainly perceive (preparatorily to ver. 23) what is the key to the understanding of the inmost meaning of the word, that which alone satisfies its meaning: *The way of the first disciples between the passion and pentecost is a type of the whole interval of the Lord's church between His departure to the Father and His final return.* This is to be understood according to the genius of the New Testament, where the prophetical-typical history already carries in itself the essence of its fulfilment (which in the Old Testament only *sometimes* and in a certain sense *preparatorily* is the case).

The child-bearing woman is further the church through the Spirit within her, yea, humanity itself as far as it is called, and by the Spirit also within it prepared, to become the church. Now are the many children born, like the dew of the morning-

[1] For neither ἤξετε nor ἀρεῖ is a correct reading: both originated in an ignorant emendation.

Hosted by Google

dawn; but the dawn is ever preceded by the night. That which is received and prepared in secret (Ps. cxxxix. 15) is, in *every one* who withstands not this preparation, at the right time when his hour is come, born in a first complete birth. But the new-born disciples of Christ have still much sorrow in the world, they enter through much tribulation into the kingdom of God; the whole church included as One in Christ has no other way to pass in its process through the ages. In the meanwhile, and all around it, the world rejoices on. The children of this world take their childish pleasure in natural life, in its strength, gifts, and advantages—this is the least thing, although that which in children is natural and *relatively* innocent, in the adult can be no other than folly. Great folly indeed, to be willing to pursue their undisturbed pleasures—and to be able, in as far as it is a matter of will, and there is no heart towards God and eternity! But the case is worse, for in the ground of the heart and conscience the claims of God are ever enforced, His reproving Spirit continually speaks. Thus the world rejoices not only *without* God but *against* God; it rejoices wilfully *in sin*, makes that its pleasure, which should be the ground of all true and salutary sorrow. Then cometh the Christ, whom the Spirit preaches, across its path—and the world despises and crucifies Him in His members, rejoices in an imaginary victory over Him; and that is, in the awful fulfilment of the first type, the lying Passover and perverted Purim which our modern pseudo-Christendom, with its babbling about its own God and its own "redemption," celebrates.

But he who—and he *alone* who can no longer rejoice with this world, finds imperishable joy, and that ever more increasing in the way through true sorrow. If we are found in this way of true discipleship we *cannot idly enjoy* this life, for we have learned with the Preacher the vanity of all things earthly, and the dread solemnity of death and judgment. We say to the laughter, which dances on the edge of the abyss, It is mad; and to the mirth, which prepares for itself eternal anguish, What doeth it? (Eccles. ii. 2.) We have known and felt, yea, we know and feel in more and more entire crucifixion with Christ, our own sinfulness and sin; and if in this our sorrow, as we hang upon the cross, the world in mocking sympathy

Hosted by Google

would reach to us its deadening potion, we put it from us as our Lord did. All worldly consolation is a mockery and horror, in all worldly joy we taste the bitterness of sin. Therefore we also mourn and weep, as our Lord did over Jerusalem, over the sin and blindness of the world, in the spirit of His members and brethren, Ps. xxxv. 12–14. Those who are marked with the ת of the cross sigh and cry for all the abominations that be done in the midst of Jerusalem, Ezek. ix. 4. And in this last sense we have much distress, that *we see not Jesus*.[1] Nevertheless, with all the ever-recurring affliction[2] of His people, there is ever recurring also for His church and every individual member of it the Easter and the Pentecost, witnessed by constant external and internal victories, in which the Living One sees us again and quickens us; infuses into our hearts new joy through His Spirit, a joy which finally no man can take away. As the sum of all: Every disciple of Jesus through his entire life, the church of Christ as a whole down to the end of the days, learns and experiences in the cross of Christ that true sorrow which genders *joy*, receives and enjoys *this* as the fruit of the resurrection and Pentecost in a progressive measure ever approaching perfection—until the great day dawns which will be followed by no night, because light and darkness, the new heavenly humanity and the humanity which is lost, will have then been sundered for ever through the throes of the Spirit which continue through the ages, and bring that to perfection in the church which Christ brought to perfection in Himself.

Vers. 23, 24. When, in immediate connection with what has just been said, we find the *greatest* promise connected with the strikingly prominent ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ—it becomes needful to

[1] "Yea, the Christian grieves that he *does not find* Jesus, whom he would fain meet everywhere, in so many ages and in so many places, in so many men and in so many families, in so many circumstances and in so many solemn offices. It irks him sore that he seeks Him in vain without whom there is no truth, no life, no peace, in so many books, churches, sermons, songs, and prayers!" Brandt's Predigtbuch zu Jubilate.

[2] For every new generation of men must undergo this pang of birth, the same transition from sorrow to joy, which is by no means the result of our "weakness of faith." (This against Schleiermacher, who will evade the strict reference of this to every individual! Homil. ii. 533.)

Hosted by Google

mark carefully the meaning of this formula. It is obvious that it cannot mean any actual individual *day;* and we cannot avoid seeing that the *time* signified by it *begins* with the day of the resurrection, if we have rightly understood that the great turning-point of the Future, which our Lord since ch. xiv. 3 has had always before His eyes, has its commencement in the resurrection morning after the night of suffering and death. The same form of expression is used to signify this in ch. xiv. 20. But as certainly as we have seen embraced in vers. 20–22 a comprehensive glance at all the future of the church, must we, in this connected but heightened conclusion of all, give the words their furthest reach of signification. The Lord, as we think at least, intends this ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, corresponding with the prophetic בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא, first of all to include the whole period of the dispensation of the Spirit, which already typically commenced in His first return and seeing them again;—and then pre-eminently the *end* of this time, the *consummation of the fulness of the Spirit* in His own, when He shall have unfolded and imparted all that is Christ's to His people. This is plain from the greatness of the promise connected with it, which can never have its full realisation till that goal is reached. And in that day *ye shall ask Me nothing!* Great and unfathomable word! The ancient expositors, finding that αἰτεῖν is subsequently spoken of, would take ἐρωτᾷν in the same sense of *putting a request;*[1] Grotius, and after him B.-Crusius, repeats this, the latter asserting that "ἐρωτᾷν as in ver. 26 is that referred to an *individual* matter which αἰτεῖσθαι is in *general*." But ver. 26 is far from being as decisive as that in ver. 19 ἐρωτᾷν is *questioning* and so recurs in ver. 30:—the necessity of asking, as abolished through consummated knowledge in the light and life of the Spirit, is evidently the fundamental idea. It may be remarked that as both meanings are included in the one Heb. שׁאל, the ideas of begging and questioning pass one into the other; hence Theophylact more correctly afterward, and Augustin, admit both senses in the word. We shall see how much truth there is in this; and now holding to the main idea obviously indicated, we would *ask* ourselves, long after Pentecost, whether we have reached such a point

[1] So Chrys., Theophyl., Theod. Mops., Theod. Heracl., and others.

Hosted by Google

that we have *nothing more* (*οὐκ—οὐδέν*) actually to inquire about? Whether the Apostles themselves reached that point even in *their* life? Augustin says, We hear the Lord Christ inquired of, after He had risen. The last question at the ascension, Acts i. 6, is inquiring enough, and is even repelled by being referred to the far futurity. It is true, indeed, that a not asking through joy and contentment is here promised, even as in ver. 5 the not asking through sorrow was blamed; it is nevertheless wrong to restrict this strongly emphasized word to mean merely, Ye shall not ask concerning that which I now speak of, ye shall not despondingly ask about My going away. (Theophyl.: *οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον οἷον καὶ πρώην· ποῦ ὑπάγεις ;*) For the *ποῦ ὑπάγεις*, which the Lord desired in ver. 5, was not the questioning of sorrowful perplexity, but the true inquiry of spiritual intelligence; when therefore He now speaks of "asking *nothing* more," He can mean only the consummate satisfaction both of knowledge and of experience (which always go together). (Theoph. afterward correcting himself, says, *πάντα γὰρ γνώσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι.*) Had the disciples reached this point at the day of Pentecost? Did not the Spirit lead them by degrees into all truth? And lead them, too, through the instrumentality of this further prayer for increasing light and power of life in the Spirit? And is not *praying* also a kind of *asking*?[1] We find, indeed, in ver. 26 an *αἰτήσεσθε* connected with the *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*, but this contradiction is only thus to be explained, that there the entire period of the dispensation of the Spirit is referred to, while here in ver. 23 it is specially its goal and end. The way to no more supplicating and no more questioning, is to supplicate and question all the more diligently till that day comes:—that is the connection in which ver. 23 is continued.

This connection, however, is very generally misunderstood. Even Meyer restricts the not asking, as if their praying nevertheless was altogether parallel and simultaneous, when he remarks, "Ye shall be able then with all your *doubts*, etc., to turn directly to heaven, ye shall need My *visible presence* in the flesh no more." Just as Neander, "They should then need His sensible presence no longer, the Father Himself would impart to

[1] "Thus all asking will not cease, since every petition is also an inquiry." V. Gerlach.

Hosted by Google

them all things." Grotius, similarly, "The ἐμέ preceding seems to prove that this member is to be opposed to what follows. The disciples were troubled, because they would not then have Jesus *present*." Nor otherwise Bengel, Ye shall apply to the Father Himself. And that with the dismissal of all desire for the visible presence of Jesus.[1] Origen pressed this so far as to deduce from the imaginary antithesis between ἐμέ and τὸν πατέρα the inference that prayer should not be directed to the Son. (de Orat. § 50.) But we need only to push the thought to this its extreme point, and its incorrectness immediately appears. It would be altogether out of harmony with the fundamental idea of these last discourses, that Jesus should thus place His own person in opposition to the Father (or even to the Spirit). It is obvious that then first do His disciples pray to or ask of *Him* aright, when they pray to the Father or inquire of the Spirit. (And we do not find with the αἰτεῖτε a second time τὸν πατέρα expressly added, just as we do not in ch. xiv.—and this is here of more significance!) Thus the emphasis does not lie upon the ἐμέ, but on the strong οὐκ ἐρωτήσετε οὐδέν, the full meaning of which must not be impaired. In ch. xiv. 20 perfect *knowledge* was promised; but in this passage that consummation comes into more decided prominence, as the proper and final goal of all. We were right, consequently, in asserting at the outset that the promise of the *coming again* in these chapters embraces all that may come under that idea in one great perspective, extending finally *to that great day*;[2] we see here how that assertion approves itself, and how most appropriate it was that these farewell discourses for His then present and

[1] Similarly Fikenscher, "The emphasis is on the word *Me*. The disciples should no longer ask Jesus, but His *Spirit*—then would all curious, spiritless, anxious, carnal questioning cease."

[2] Kling reaches the same result, and finds here in Jno. xiv.–xvi. "that *the Parousia of Christ in a wider sense rules all*, there is a continuous revelation, a continuous coming and making Himself present—which, however, is in a more marked and decisive manner evidenced at the great epochs of the history of the kingdom of God, and at the turning-points of its development." (Rheinische Monatsch. 1846.) He rightly places Matt. xxviii. 20 by the side of Jno. xiv.–xvi. as the ground-text of eschatology, but we would add that the "until" is not wanting even in St John; we have it in ch. xvi. 22, 23.

Hosted by Google

future disciples should have so extensive a reach. The ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς here in ver. 22 is, in its general meaning for the church still from age to age pursuing the way of the cross, the same final and absolute return which we found in the beginning at ch. xiv. 3:—to the individual when he is taken home in death, to the whole body at the Parousia which we wait for. Thus the end falls back into and coincides with the beginning.

In the eternal glory, which will be the final issue of all temporal adversity, "all our past doubts will be solved, all our complaints silenced, and *all our questioning answered* for ever; then will be fully accomplished the saying, And in that day ye shall ask Me nothing more; that is, ye shall know and understand all, ye shall look through the whole way through your sorrows past into eternal joy, the whole way through the world of your tribulation unto Me who overcame the world."[1] Dietz, after discoursing upon our bias to *ask* unseasonable questions in our affliction, says, "But *one day* in that world He will, in a manner beyond all comprehension of ours, justify Himself for all; He will make it clear to our eyes that His ways were altogether goodness and truth.[2] And *then* shall we ask Him no more." And in the same manner speaks Luther in his Jubilate-sermon, where, doing full justice to the understanding given by the Spirit, he asserts notwithstanding, "But *in this present life* nothing is to be fundamentally and fully understood." These are thoughts which a preacher applying the words to the congregation cannot avoid deducing, and this homiletic exegesis must approve itself to be the sole perfect interpretation. Do *we* now carry our thoughts upon the Lord's promise further than He Himself carried them? Storr, bound by his false grammatical-historical exegesis, asks nevertheless with all simplicity, "May we not also apply to the final goal of hope which Jesus had set

[1] As many years ago I expounded it in the sermon quoted before.

[2] Then will the fulfilment go beyond the figure of the woman in labour, since the *no more remembering the anguish* will be fulfilled in heaven, and yet *not* fulfilled. In nature, as in the beginnings of grace, we must forget the anguish in order to be happy; but the pangs of the passion and new birth of the soul will be an eternal memorial to the honour of God, whose spiritual working they proclaim; and in heaven first will the anguish itself become joy. The remembrance of penitence and chastisement, and therefore of the sin which needed them, will not interrupt but heighten our happiness.

Hosted by Google

before His Apostles, and of which His visit after His death was the seal, that which He spoke concerning the time when they should at His resurrection see Him again—In that day ye shall ask Me nothing? Will it not indeed be pre-eminently true of *that* period when we shall be with Jesus in His Father's house, beholding His visible glory for ever, that then we shall need to ask no more?" But what right should we have to push the meaning of our Lord's words so far beyond the meaning in which He is supposed to have used them? The solution of the whole lies here, that He spoke this οὐκ ἐρωτήσετε οὐδέν concerning the day of resurrection or pentecost, *only in as far as* that introductory day was the starting-point and *type of the perfect day of the Spirit*, and in its strict literalness only of the consummation and close of this latter.

Our way to heaven, also, in the following and fellowship of Jesus in His way through sorrow to the Father, is conducting us to this same end, the perfect issues of this great birth. Jesus is still continually giving us His pledge that we shall in a little while see Him again; the difference is only this, that now the day has already dawned, the access is open wide, inasmuch as true asking and praying presently finds hearing and answer, and faith having the earnest of the Spirit has the victory of the future already in anticipation. Jesus takes His farewell of the disciples in the word which we shall hear in ver. 33; thus there is as yet no perfect joy and satisfaction, there is still the interchange of anxiety and confidence, of dying and living (2 Cor. vi. 9, 10) —after the forgotten pangs of travail new tribulation—after the *I believe! I know!* many a new doubt and mystery. And on this account our Lord, after having pointed to the final goal, continues His encouragement in the way thus—But now, in the bright hope of that great day, *ask and pray as ye have never done before!*

The Ἀμὴν ἀμήν which commences this gracious encouragement has misled many, as in the church pericopes (where it might be justified), so also in exposition, to begin a new section with this *Verily*. Luther: "He has now ended the sermon, and told the disciples all they were to know. He will now close; and gives a final encouragement to prayer." But this disturbs the compact connection—Till then pray on! and the new and

Hosted by Google

closing section is indicated plainly in ver. 25 by the ταῦτα λελάληκα. The Lord simply repeats here what He had said in ch. xiv. 13, 14; and we must refer thither for the exposition of praying *in His name*, and of the universality of the promise (here ὅσα ἂν—). Hitherto ye have asked nothing in My name—this is not a "reproof" (as Braune and Rieger think), but confirms our exposition in ch. xiv., of what this praying *in the name of Jesus* properly is. Such prayer had not been possible to any even the highest saints and petitioners, not to the disciples themselves, before Jesus was glorified. The Lord's Prayer itself became then a great truth to the disciples, when they came to know that Jesus had gone from them to the Father, and for what end He had gone. "This manner of prayer generally had never yet been known among the saints upon earth—it announces itself as something altogether *new*.[1] As in the Old-Testament way of holiness the problem had ever been to learn better how to *pray*, so also *we* have in the practice of prayer in the name of Jesus the only way of progress toward perfect holiness, knowledge, and joy of heart. All the discourses, exhortations, encouragements of our Lord find their ultimate aim in directing us to perfect prayer: *therefore* we have this word of the beginning of the discourse, which stands also in the middle of it, ch. xv. 7, recurring with all its emphasis at the close. Αἰτεῖτε—this *imperative* of the Sermon on the Mount, now illustrated and strengthened by *in My name*, is uttered here at the farewell with the utmost graciousness. It is the most benevolent permission, as well as the most solemn and urgent commandment, of Him whose desire is our *joy*. Ask, so shall ye *receive!* Many alas who only half pray, and do not urge their knocking even to pressing in, cannot afterward *receive* even what they have prayed for! But persistent prayer "obtains for me the blessing that I can receive and appropriate that which the Father gives. I actually obtain the

[1] In Krummacher's Elias iii. S. 85–102, there is an episode on praying in the name of Jesus which gives the truth beautifully, but in too paradoxical expression. Thus, when it is said with strong emphasis that it is equal to our standing in the place of Jesus, we miss the befitting counterpart —rather Jesus standing in ours. And the *substance* of our prayer is indeed presupposed, but not adequately expressed,—that we must pray only as touching the kingdom of God, and for everything else as subject to its conditions.

Hosted by Google

hand which enables me to lay hold of and receive the heavenly gifts." (C. K. Rieger.) Only in this way will His joy in us, even as our own finally, become full, πεπληρωμένη, so that nothing more shall be wanting to us! See ch. xv. 11, and mark now the goal to which ver. 22 pointed.[1] The world has its vain, sinful, distracted, enforced joy over the abyss into which it is plunging; and that it cannot pray, either in joy or in the tribulations which already give their warning, is its true misery and the beginning of its judgment. But the disciples of Jesus *pray* themselves in the way of the cross even into heaven, where they finally have their full fruition. Then will they see Him, whom, having not seen, they love, and have believed in; but the faith, which looks to this end, must, during the whole progress of the way, rightly understand and joyfully appropriate the word of the true Comforter— *Yet a little while* and ye shall *see* Me, for I will come to take you to the Father where I am, I will return to fetch you home.

FINAL REFERENCE TO THE GREAT FUTURE: NOW IN PARABLE, THEN OPENLY: THE LOVE AND FAITH OF THE DISCIPLES IN MUCH WEAKNESS; LAST CONSOLATION DERIVED FROM HIS OVERCOMING THE WORLD.

(Ch. xvi. 25–33.)

Ver. 25 opens the final winding up of these discourses to the disciples, the proper conclusion of the whole, rounded by "*these things have I said unto you*" both at its beginning and end. In a last reference to their future understanding the Lord declares emphatically all His previous sayings to have been obscure, to be as yet—not so much unintelligible in themselves (for how could He ever so speak?)—as not understood by the disciples. The reason of this is twofold. As no prophetic word can be properly and fully understood before its actual fulfilment, so here—When the things of which He had spoken shall come to pass, the veil of obscurity will fall from His mysterious words.

[1] "Until ye obtain *all things* and have your full joy; which prayer will be first fulfilled on the last day." (Luther.)

Hosted by Google

Nevertheless, the blessed disciples would have understood at least much more than they did, if the veil had not been upon their hearts and minds. Yea, they *believed in* Him and *loved* Him, as He graciously and solemnly testifies here; but their faith is so little based upon knowledge, their love is still so weak, that He is constrained to connect with this the fore-announcement of their immediately impending *σκορπίζεσθαι εἰς τὰ ἴδια*. His concluding address, therefore, resolves itself, as we said in the introductory analysis, into three parts. In vers. 25–28 He consoles them, while He, without any questioning or suggestion of theirs, alludes to the feeling of His words' mysteriousness which filled their minds, by the promise of a future *ἀναγγέλλειν παῤῥησίᾳ*[1] from which will follow their asking and receiving unto fulness of joy; yea, He goes so far as to assure them, for the sake of the love and faith, which they already have, of the especial love of the Father, and to seal this again in ver. 28 by the plainest recognition of their faith in His having come forth from God.—But when the simple disciples prematurely suppose, thereby revealing their ignorance, that they already understand Him, and regard this as the promised future enlightenment, asserting their weak confused *we believe* with an emphatic *by this*—He is constrained in vers. 31, 32 to answer, It is true that ye do believe, but how soon will My passion make manifest your real and great weakness! And now He is come to the very threshold of the hour, He can say no more but must let it come, that it may bring all things with it and make all things plain; He therefore breaks off abruptly with a final *word of encouragement and victory* which merges all the anxiety of His present and future disciples (not forgotten even here!) into the *peace* which He bequeathes and promises, the foundation of that peace being *His own victory*, anticipated before the conflict in perfect faith. Finally, to witness and seal the *I have overcome* there remains nothing more than the *prayer* to the Father who glorifieth Him and whom He glorifieth.

Ver. 25. *Παροιμία* is, in common Greek, as we all know, a *proverb*, a common current word, which not only—as in the proverbs of all nations—sets forth a general truth and often

[1] For we read *ἀναγγελῶ* here also, after vers. 13, 14, 15, and not, with Tisch. and Lach. *ἀπαγγελῶ*—of which more anon.

Hosted by Google

recurring fact in a figurative form, but also in this figurativeness intimates a teaching—wise or the reverse—which is not at once manifest.[1] In oriental scriptural phraseology it appears still more plain that every παροιμιῶδες is also αἰνιγματῶδες. And we know the pregnant meaning of the Hebrew מָשָׁל, for which the Sept. not only in the superscription of Solomon's sentences, but frequently elsewhere (*e.g.* 1 Sam. x. 12; Ezek. xviii. 2), has παροιμία. In Sirach it is the common expression for the sentences of the wise which are to be pondered—ch. vi. 35, παροιμίαι συνέσεως—ch. viii. 8—xlvii. 17, παροιμίαις καὶ παραβολαῖς—ch. xxxix. 3, ἀπόκρυφα παροιμιῶν, ἐν αἰνίγμασι παραβολῶν. When the Lord here says that He had spoken ἐν παροιμίαις, He presupposes first (what is generally overlooked) that He, Himself the truth and more than Solomon, could not do otherwise than speak in sentences full of deep meaning; but then He makes prominent the mysteriousness, unintelligible to the disciples, of His sayings, as the *opposite* παρρησία immediately shows. Further, His ταῦτα λελάληκα refers not merely to what had directly preceded, but first to the whole of the farewell discourses, and then further back and more generally to all His sayings. We must not adhere too closely (in opposition to the whole scriptural usage as derived from the Old Testament) to the specific signification *proverb*, *parable*, or *similitude*, as if only such were meant in the παροιμίαι as that of the shepherd in ch. x. 6. It is true that since ch. xiv. 1 there has been much proverbial, parabolical, figurative expression;—the woman in child-birth, the friends and the servants, the vine; and, besides these, even the way, the house, the dwellings, yea even the official name of the Spirit, παράκλητος.[2] But has there not

[1] The derivation from παρά and οἶμος, οἴμη, the way, is certain, but the signification not so plain. Most probably—obvia usuque trita formula dicendi. Not derived from the sentences which have been set up as waymarks—as some have artificially supposed. Thus, not in the etymology, but in the thing itself, for which the word was originated, lies the further idea that it is (as Lampe cites a definition)—λόγος ἐπικαλύπτων τὸ σαφὲς ἀσαφείᾳ ἢ δι' αἰσθητῶν πραγμάτων σημαίνων πράγματα νοητά, ἢ ἐπικεκρυμμένην τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπεμφαίνων.

[2] The remark of Hess as it respects this last is very acute, that in the Acts and the Epistles this figurative expression is no longer found, because the then present Comforter is known and experienced as the *Spirit*. Else-

Hosted by Google

been as much or even more plain literal discourse interposed, in the *form* of which there has been nothing mysterious or concealed? And yet all this must be included in *these things!* We must consequently regard two things as established in this still figurative sentence:—that "*in proverbs*" indicates obscurity generally, and that the ground of it was specially in the disciples themselves. When in Ezekiel the third great period of prophecy began,[1] in which prophecy assumed its clearest form, as literally plain as was then possible and fit, Ezekiel—who unites in himself as it were the more plain Jeremiah and the most obscure Daniel—gives always the interpretation of his visions and similitudes, even as afterwards Zechariah did. Nevertheless they say of him (so that he finally spoke in plainer terms)—הֲלֹא מְמַשֵּׁל מְשָׁלִים הוּא, ch. xxi. 5 (xx. 49). In the same sense all that which the Lord had now spoken so clearly remains to the disciples, ἐν παροιμίαις (for which the Heb. N. T. should rather have put בְּמָשָׁלִים than בִּחִידוֹת); and concerning His plainest words they say—*we know not what He saith.* This is the meaning of the Lord, by which He disclosed their thought and laid bare their darkness, as they afterwards, ver. 30, acknowledge. Thus Glassius is not to be despised here, when he remarks:—The ἐν παροιμίαις is to be understood here φαινομένως, putatively, *res pro rei opinione*—only that this not understanding of the disciples has itself an objective ground in the futurition of the things spoken of. The Lord also had expounded His parables to the disciples, as Ezekiel to all the people, had commended their seeing eyes and hearing ears, had graciously imputed to them an understanding of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven. (Mark iv. 34; Matt. xiii. 11, 16.) But in that higher degree of contrast with a true understanding which the εὐαγγέλιον πνευματικόν discloses, those expositions themselves, equally with the plainest

where we find, *e.g.*, in the letters of the churches of Lyons and Vienne (Euseb. v. 1), that a martyr had ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν παράκλητον.

[1] The first was the directly historical prophecy from Jacob's blessing downward, culminating in Samuel's predictions; the second introduces the *typical* cycle, which rests upon 2 Sam. vii., develops itself through the Psalms and Prophets, and conclusively in Jeremiah and Daniel. Compare my Isaiah, Introduction, S. 21–30.

Hosted by Google

words (see Lu. xviii. 34), remained even to the disciples pure parable, which yet waited for its interpretation.

The ἔρχεται ὥρα which follows appears to lose its strict connection through the ἀλλά, which is at least an uncertain reading, and inserted simply for the sake of a superficial meaning. It should be either καὶ ἔρχεται (which also may be a mere interpolation), or, as we prefer, the plain unconnected ἔρχεται. This best corresponds with the Lord's meaning, in which the consolation was intended to follow directly, and so far quite parallel with the former clause as in *both* sentences something real and necessary in the process of the matter was to be announced. They might even be connected by γάρ—All that has been hitherto said must necessarily have been obscure before the day of the Spirit, *for* this will first *come* in order to your understanding! Then the soothing and reassuring promise is found already bound up in the former clause. We see that παῤῥησίᾳ, or ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ, proceeding first from confidence in the speaker (ch. vii. 13, 26), indicates further generally that which is disclosed and open, as in Mark viii. 32, Col. ii. 15, and in other passages of this gospel, ch. vii. 4, x. 24, xi. 14, 54. Lachm. and Tisch. would read ἀπαγγελῶ instead of ἀναγγελῶ, which however in the Synoptics as well as in St John, ch. iv. 51, xx. 18, has reference rather to external reports; the ἀναγγέλλειν is more in St John's style, and here reminds of ch. xvi. 13, etc.: The Lord Himself will do it, in that the Spirit doeth it. Compare also for the emphasis of the word the Samaritan woman's expectation—ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν πάντα, ch. iv. 25. We cannot see how, as Lücke thinks, there is a παροιμία in the Lord's describing the Spirit's communication as His own; this interchange of the expression throughout these chapters (now —I myself; now—the Spirit), contains rather a profound truth, as we have already seen. Does not the Lord most actually and essentially come and speak *Himself* in the Spirit, with whom He is one?

Περὶ τοῦ πατρός has been understood in two ways: either as equivalent to τὰ περί, the counsels of the Father;[1] or, specifically (according to ch. xiv. 20), concerning the Father as

[1] Grotius: What is the Father's will touching My kingdom, and what things ye ought to pray for from Him.

Hosted by Google

Mine, that I am and how I am in and from the Father, and the Father in Me. But there is no dilemma here; the two are indissolubly one, the former being wrapped up in the latter alone. The final and full revelation of the New Testament through the Son in the Spirit terminates in what could never, properly speaking, be plainly revealed in the Old Testament—that there is a *Father* in the Godhead. And thus, inasmuch as we penetrate through the Son to the otherwise hidden primal principle of the Father-God, this is the most emphatic and perfect note of His full revelation—περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀναγγελῶ; and Lücke with great propriety compares ch. xvii. 6, I have manifested *Thy name.*

But when came *the hour* which the Lord here promises? Assuredly not first at that end of the day to which ver. 23 especially pointed, for ὥρα must indicate a specific time within the bounds of that day. Thus it is the *first* hour of it, the dawn in which the day is actually come; and because it is come, ver. 26, returning back from the end in οὐκ ἐρωτᾷν οὐδέν to the αἰτεῖν which leads to that end, speaks again of ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. Nevertheless, the "coming" hour is especially the beginning, and that as opposed to a preceding *hour* of distraction, anxiety, and obscuration of faith, of which ver. 32 speaks designedly with the same expression. The two hours are altogether the same, as we find them described in juxtaposition in ver. 16; consequently, what was there said concerning the *terminus a quo* for the seeing and knowing of the disciples, holds good here. The great transition begins in the *resurrection,* and during the forty days the Lord can already speak to them παῤῥησίᾳ *of the kingdom of God,* and open their understandings to comprehend the Scripture and His discourses as they had not been opened before; but it is *the Spirit* who brings the completion and sets the seal upon all. Even at the end of the forty days (as the last veil upon the Apostles' minds shows, Acts i. 6), the *promise* of the Holy Spirit was yet pending, and what Luther says was true: "That which I now tell you in *bodily presence,* I will by the Spirit illustrate and speak openly, so that ye shall apprehend the Father, and what My going to Him is,—that I sit at His right hand as your Representative and Intercessor, that all things have come to pass in Me in order to

Hosted by Google

your being able to come *to the Father* also." Yes, verily, *of the Father*, that He through Me is yours also, and ye His beloved children who have free access to His presence—this also is plainly included in the simple τοῦ πατρός, which from this time is the only expression used, vers. 26–28 and again ver. 32.

When the Romanists bring ver. 25 to support their prominent doctrine of the "obscurity of Holy Scripture," they are guilty of the folly of either disowning the free and living administration of the Spirit in connection with it, or of digging a channel for the Spirit in ecclesiastical tradition and authority. Does not the Lord promise here, when He is speaking of that obscurity, the coming of clear light, and that for all His disciples, for every inquiring and praying mind, without any further instrumentality?—When Olshausen somewhat restricts the fulness of the promise by saying, "But it may be asserted that *human language generally is a* παροιμία, since it can never be adequate fully to express Divine things," he is so far right as his meaning is that of the Apostle in 1 Cor. xiii. 12. The figurativeness of all human speech in bringing Divine things into human relations, must be conceded with its proper limitations; and consequently the imperfection (δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι) of all our thoughts and notions as bound down to human language; even the apostolical words and writings, in which the Spirit speaks, retain their מְשֻׁלִּים into which we with the Apostles themselves desire to look, not attaining to that immediate contemplation which is reserved for eternity. But the ἀναγγέλλειν, which is *internal* in the Spirit (not λαλεῖν again) is something very different from the *expression* of what it deals with. Nor is it as if the Lord "were *opposing* to the use of this weak medium (human speech) the promise of the interposition of a more internal and essential medium"—for the speech of the Spirit is as speech perfect and strong, as in itself the λαλεῖν of the Lord had already been, but *there comes with it and in addition to it* the *internal opening* of the essential understanding which can indeed never be represented in word. He who speaketh in the Spirit knows and means more than the letter can express; yet the letter again is perfect to this end, that all who hear *the Spirit* may thereby receive the true know-

Hosted by Google

ledge; it expresses even more than may as yet be developed in the personal consciousness of him who is thus moved by the Spirit. But the knowledge given by the Spirit is and must ever be,—albeit only approximately in gradual progression reaching to the final goal,—in reality, and *in as far as* it is a living union with the object of that knowledge, perfect knowledge, a *continuous* explanation of all παροιμία, which every λαλία in human words, even that of the Spirit, must always contain for the limited understanding of man.

Vers. 26, 27. The state of perfection which knows no need is not yet; there is still the asking, and yet it is the *same day*. When the end of that day is reached, in which it will melt into the fulness of eternity, into perfect light and life, then indeed there will be no more asking. Now in the meantime the growing *knowledge* of the *Father* of Jesus Christ as our Father leads ever more deeply into *prayer;* but the exercise and experience of prayer requires again that knowledge. The first prayer of all, which follows, and is prompted by the all-attractive, never exhausted "Our Father," seeks the hallowing of His name, a more perfect and more living knowledge of it than is already possessed. But at the same time, inasmuch as through the Spirit in Christ every promise of God is already Yea and Amen, the first invocation anticipates the last glorying of praise:—we seal every prayer with a doxology reaching forth, in confident and tranquil trust, toward the future eternity; and thus it is already the same *day* in the light of which we ask and receive the answer, we pray and receive.

When the Lord first spoke of praying in the name of Jesus, ch. xiv., He attributed to Himself the hearing of the prayer, when He should be with the Father, expressly saying twice—*I will do it!* The same is obviously presupposed here, and by no means retracted. Similarly, it was then said concerning the all comprehending, highest gift which could be prayed for from the Father (Lu. xi. 13), the Holy Spirit, I will pray the Father for Him on your behalf,—and with an ἐρωτήσω which must be rigorously distinguished from our αἰτεῖν. Can we suppose *this* mediating intercession of the Son not to be here presupposed, and that word concerning it to be *retracted?* This cannot be thought of, and something else consistent with the former words

Hosted by Google

must be meant by the saying, *καὶ οὐ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω.* Still more! The abiding intercession and mediation of the Lord, as it includes this *in My name*, is not only the constant doctrine of Scripture (Rom. viii. 34; Heb. vii. 25; 1 Jno. ii. 1) —but we have *here* immediately afterwards His prayer, emphatically for His own, *Ἐγὼ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐρωτῶ!* (Ch. xvii. 9.) All this has very justly moved the expositors to modify the negation of the *ἐρωτᾷν περὶ ὑμῶν*, and to explain it as only a relative denial. But *how* are we to understand this? Many, from the earliest times down to the present, have laid stress upon the circumstance that it is not simply *οὐκ ἐρωτήσω*, but merely *οὐ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι*, and this would mean, I will not once more declare this, it is understood of itself. Similarly Grotius: I pass by that, as less important than that which I would *now* infer from it. Most plainly, however, the Hirsch. Bibel: "I will not repeat what I have already promised you for your encouragement, that I, etc. It is spoken as when one scarcely touches, but passes over a thing which is already certain enough, in order to impress all the more vividly another equally important principle and argument." Kuinoel has put it most strongly, *ut taceam;* and Seiler translates, I will not now say anything about the fact that—I will. But this *οὐ λέγω* is manifestly no mere *ut taceam*, taking for granted; the Lord does expressly touch the subject, not simply to introduce *another* argument to persuade them of their *being heard*, but the *γάρ* actually gives a *reason* for the earnestly meant *οὐκ ἐρωτήσω*, and consequently there must be in it a positive, if also a relative, truth. And the interpretation thus indicated says *too little*, and does not extend to the proper meaning of the words. On the other hand, Bengel, forgetting for a moment the other words of Jesus and writings of the Spirit, says far *too much* when he briefly points to *οὐ λέγω*, 1 Jno. v. 16, where *non-dico* is regarded as simply standing for *dico-non*. How then are we to solve it, so as to understand in what sense Jesus at once prays for the disciples, and prays for them not? The solution, the intimation of the *specific sense* in which the *negation* is here to be understood, is found partly in the *αὐτὸς ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ* and partly in the *φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς*. When the Lord in ch. v. 45 testified by the strong affirmation *μὴ δοκεῖτε* that *He* would not *accuse* the un-

Hosted by Google

believers to the Father, that was absolutely and literally meant; when He on the other hand here denies a certain *intercession* for those who already believe on Him, and already pray, it is His design first to repel generally a false notion concerning the Father, who requires first to be prayed unto, and then to distinguish between two kinds of intercession.

Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ πατήρ—that is, suâ sponte, proprio motu, *αὐτόματος*, or as Nonnus has it, *αὐτοκέλευτος*. This word therefore (oh that all preachers and theologians would understand it well!) most decisively overturns that false notion concerning the entire work of redemption which the writer will ever contend against and exhibit as *unscriptural*—that notion which attributes to the Father a wrath which is to be extinguished, and not also that reconciling love which from eternity needed not first to be propitiated. See ch. iii. 16, and what was said there. This great and gloomy misunderstanding pursues many believers into their *prayers*, hangs upon the best too often, and prevents them from entering into the full confidence and gladness of praying to the Father in the name of Jesus. Theirs is that frequent prayer, of which Krummacher says, "I regard the Father as still strange, alienated, and far off, *myself* as *shielded* through Christ from His *wrath*. I remain standing in fear before the gate of God, and *anxiously put forward my guarantee*, because I am still affrighted before Him. The feeling of my guilt, and of the holiness of God, outweighs all in my soul, not that of my *justification* before Him and His *love*." Such is, indeed, too often, but such should not be, the case! The Lord Christ with His atoning sacrifice has not interposed "like a screen or a lightning-conductor" between us and the wrathful Father; even those who come to Him in their first repentance should not think so, much less believers and the redeemed. Else would the Father be hidden and disguised by Christ, instead of being revealed; His honour would be lowered and placed *beneath* that of the loving Son, if He Himself, who sent and gave the Son, made Him for us a *ἱλαστήριον*, *loved* us not and were not *love itself!* But the "*righteous* Father" (ch. xvii. 25) does Himself love, and the world's knowing Him not consists most in this, that it is ignorant how entirely He is in Christ a Father and full of love.

Hosted by Google

Christians who believe, to whom Christ has revealed this in all its clearness, cannot too often be reminded of this: "think not too little of the love wherewith *ye* are loved!" Not merely has the Father Himself already loved them as He loves all the world and every creature, but He loves *them* with that *especial* love which He bears to those in whom He finds Christ's word, and through faith in it Christ Himself, who stand before Him clothed in the garment of the righteousness of His Son. It was of this that ch. xiv. 21 spoke. We may and we ought to approach confidently to the *Father* Himself, and through the mediating work in which we stand *immediately* pray; learning better and better to repeat after our great Pattern in the flesh the *Abba* which He uttered before the rending of the veil, which to Him was yet no veil. The Father-heart, full of eternal Divine love, is open to us; how should *that* impel and allure us confidently and in the fulness of assurance to pray; deriving from this saying all that our hearts want even unto their perfect joy! But what then are we to say of the intercession of Jesus, which is maintained elsewhere, but here in some sense denied? We may say with propriety (as our Lord Himself, in ch. xvii. 9, establishes the distinction), that the first intercession of Jesus which paves the way, opens the door, to those who come to Him from the world and through Him to God (Heb. vii. 25), is something quite different, and that *this*[1] is indeed no longer necessary to those who have already come. V. Gerlach says well and clearly, "There needed no constant renewal of the mediation of Christ in order to the *establishment* of their relation to the Father; they had become once for all children of God through faith." Luther: "This faith brings us to the Father, and then all goes on in His name. Here, then, we are assured that Christ needs no longer thus to pray for us, *since He has prevailed in prayer for us already;* we may, ourselves, through Christ, urge our way in and pray. For we have no need of another Christ who shall pray for our access; this one Christ is enough, who has pre-

[1] According to Lampe: per quam adhuc viam ad Patrem sternere discipulis necessum habebat—although he elsewhere understands this of that humilis et supplex oratio which He once for all accomplished in the flesh.

Hosted by Google

vailed already and brought us in." Those who are now first coming may, with a right feeling of the wrath of the righteous Father, fly first to Christ and cry to Him—Pray Thou for us! But when we have received grace and stand in it, we need do that in the same manner no more. This, then, would distinguish the twofold intercession before and after the πεπιστεύκατε. For of course there is an intercession for believers, such as that which goes on through ch. xvii., and that expressly for the reason that they belong to the Father through faith in Christ, see ch. xvii. 8, 9. And it *goes on* to the end of time; ch. xvii. is only the proleptical commencement of that which, properly speaking, began first in heaven. Braune thinks incorrectly that only *before* the communication of the Spirit the Lord thus prayed for His own—thus making Him the Intercessor *only* for those who are not yet actually partakers of the Holy Ghost. Forgetting altogether 1 Jno. ii. 1! Oh no, rather as Rambach says in his song, "He bears in the sanctuary the precious name of *His people* upon His breast as the true High Priest, His prayer is supported by His almighty power, for His glorified humanity sits in its perfect tabernacle." What is the object of His present prayer for His disciples? We hear it in v. Gerlach: the ever *renewed reinstatement* of the filial relation when it has been interrupted by sin (1 Jno. ii. 1, 2) makes the intercession continually still necessary, since the free love of the Father reigns only *in the filial relation itself*. This is in itself true, but not enough; we find in ch. xvii. the end of His prayer defined to be the disciples' *preservation*, their *growing holiness* and its *consummation*. Thus not simply, with Rambach, "that they may abide united to Thee"—but that they may *become* more fully united.

The Lord is far from denying this continuous, ever necessary intercession; He rather in the οὐ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι limits the οὐκ ἐρωτήσω to the special meaning which He *now* assigns it. That meaning, however, is no other than this, that He repels every notion of intercession which would represent the Father as not already loving; and further testifies to those whom the Father specially loves as believers, that in *their own prayers* themselves and as such, the first, original intercession would not be needful. Thus there is no correction of ch.

Hosted by Google

xiv. 16, but it is more definitely explained for our right apprehension of it.[1]

Finally, it is carefully to be noted that while the Saviour Himself seemingly and in a certain sense retires and leaves us to our unhindered fellowship with the Father, He does in reality make Himself most prominent in that He alone is the cause, announcer, and witness that the Father loveth us. Nitzsch: "In order that every one may seek and obtain the Father's love, we all have need of Him who makes that love credible to us, who assures us that He Himself and the Father loveth us. All have need of Him, *whose image must be livingly formed in us by faith*, whom the Father must discern in us, if He Himself is to *love* us" —that is, not only with the love of compassion but of complacency. Does the Lord then mean to say that the Father also so loves the world, as to permit and to hear all its prayer (alas, how often blind and perverted!)? Most assuredly not. Luther: "One thing must be observed here which is to be put by the side of the other, so that the text may not be taken unfairly to pieces. For He also says, The Father Himself loveth you, *because ye have believed in Me*. For He will not do away with His own mediation, as if we might pray *without* and *independently* of Him. But when we have this Mediator *in our hearts*, etc." As in another place he explains, Ye believe in Me, as—"the Father seeth My name upon and in you." Thus far has the free grace which first loved (ch. xv. 16), brought us; hence J. v. Müller in great simplicity cries, "Blessed Father! that which Thou givest Thou reckonest to us as our merit to have received!"

The decisive testimony to their faith which the Lord here gives, despite their weakness, is the same with which He most solemnly presents them to the Father afterwards, in ch. xvii. 7, 8, 25. In the πεφιλήκατε καὶ πεπιστεύκατε we must not seek to find a prospective *future*—Then when ye shall have attained to a full and perfect faith! That the *love* takes precedence of

[1] Münchmeyer thinks this explanation not simple and plain enough. He would amend it thus: "I say not that I will undertake to pray for you *Myself alone*, and that ye will not need to pray to the Father." Let the reader choose! This mere juxtaposition of the prayers (I pray and ye too) we cannot by any means admit.

Hosted by Google

the faith is to be interpreted according to the relation between believing and loving throughout these final discourses, as we have abundantly illustrated it. The πεφιλήκατε *here* follows primarily upon the φιλεῖ as a significant *anaphora;* for (to speak after the manner of men) one loves me because I love another whom he also loves—thus being one with him in this love. Thus we are raised to the level of the Father, and are one with Him, in loving Christ! "One of the first gifts which is to us the assured foretaste of eternal blessedness, consists in this, that we know ourselves to possess in the love of Christ something which we have in common with God" (Schmieder). And, with equal propriety, glancing forward to vers. 30, 31. we may say with Hiller, "In putting *love* first the Lord designedly reserved *faith* to the last; and thus placed in the lips of the disciples the *We believe!* which they presently uttered." When it is said that, in harmony with the phraseology of Scripture elsewhere, love is here referred to faith as its foundation, this is exegetically as inappropriate as it would be, on the other hand, to regard it as establishing love to be the foundation of faith, because it precedes. Lücke's declaration that "in the exhibition of the relation between the disciples and Christ *personal love* precedes a *full and perfect* faith," is true only when understood according to the fundamental idea of these farewell discourses—in which the personal decision of the heart in the living beginning of faith is called *love.* For how can personal dependence and devotion be possible without confidence in the person of him who claims it? But this trust, in the case of Jesus, has no other foundation than the acceptance of His testimony—a testimony which is asserted throughout all His words —Ἐγὼ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ (another reading παρὰ θεοῦ or παρὰ τοῦ πατρός) ἐξῆλθον.

Ver. 28. This is once more resumed and sealed anew: Your faith is justified! Verily, I have come forth from the Father, who Himself loveth you and in love hath sent Me into the world! The entire clause, ver. 28, was already anticipated by the Evangelist in ch. xiii. 3 (probably as taken from this passage); but it is here the preparation also for the following prayer—see ch. xvii. 5. It is, once more, a retrospective summary, as of the whole testimony of Jesus concerning Himself

Hosted by Google

and the counsel of God in Him, so also of His whole history from His birth to His ascension,[1] together with an intimation of the two great supernatural mysteries which are connected with these two limits of His earthly life.[2] Ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, adopted by Lachmann instead of παρά, is not to be rejected (with Lücke) "because it has a too Trinitarian tone!" For, in truth, these chapters from beginning to end have the Trinitarian tone too evidently to allow us to lose it here at the close. But the reading παρά is vindicated by its involving in its meaning the transition to the coming into the world. We cannot deny, on the other hand—weighing well ch. xvii. 5—that this ἐξῆλθον, as most of the fathers understood it, expresses the eternal going forth of the Son from the Father (parallel with the ἐκπορεύεσθαι of the Spirit, ch. xv. 26); on the other hand, most of the ancient expositors were wrong in not admitting the *transition* to the ἐλήλυθα which is already involved in it.[3] In any case, the Lord most clearly testifies that *He* WAS *with the Father*, before He came or was born into the world (still more expressly in ch. xvii.—*before the world was*)—and therefore His *pre-existence*. In our familiar inexact way of speaking we may say of men that they *come* into the world, when they are born and have their beginning in it; but the ἐλθεῖν in their case could never be asserted to be an ἐξ-ελθεῖν from any παρά.[4] Thus His Godhead as well as His humanity is here attested, and with both are bound up His whole work upon earth (ch. xvii. 4) as the reason of His condescending incarnation, and the continuation and perfecting of this work in heaven. For *to what end* did He come into the world, but to become the Saviour

[1] As Fresenius preaches, "a brief epitome of the whole history of Christ." Bengel: Recapitulationem maximam habet hic versus.

[2] Many have even found here the plan of the entire Gospel. First part—I came forth from the Father (the Prologue and Baptist's testimony)—into the world (from ch. i. 35, particularly as *life*, as *light*, down to ch. xii. 46, 50). Part second—Again I leave the world, ch. xiii.–xv., and go to the Father, ch. xvi., xvii. But with all this, compare our remarks at the outset.

[3] See the remarkable ἐξελήλυθα already in Mark i. 38 and then Jno. viii. 42.

[4] We need not now refute the notion of a pre-existent humanity which many of our pseudo-theosophists have derived from this saying; its refutation was in the σὰρξ ἐγένετο of the Prologue.

Hosted by Google

of sinners? Again, *to what end* and *in what way* does He return to the Father, but that He may accomplish eternal redemption through death, and diffuse from on high the fruits of His redeeming work? *I leave the world* is in itself a general expression, appropriate to the departure of all men by death; but the πάλιν which belongs especially to the πορεύομαι (*I go back again*, ch. vi. 62), destroys the similarity between His death and the death of all men, just as previously in the case of His birth.[1] He came—He goeth again; and the meaning is, Both through His own power. (Lampe: The spontaneity and Divine operation of the Lord is seen alike in the way of His coming, and in the way of His going again.) Similarly, He goes only in such a manner that He still remains by His Spirit; even as His coming into the world did not exclude His existing in heaven, in God the Father. The doctrine of the bodily presence of Christ in the earth is not (with Beza, Piscator, Ursinus, etc.) to be refuted by this passage, which says nothing at all about it; it does, however, attribute the "*with the Father*" to the humanity also in an exalted sense. There are three births indicated here: the eternal going forth, the birth or being begotten of the Father; the coming into the world or the birth into flesh; and the regeneration or full birth of the Son of God in humanity through the glorification. Between the two mysteries, παρὰ τοῦ πατρός—πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, comes in His life; He asserts the fact, the *how* remains unsolved, for true *faith* is not dependent upon the perfect knowledge of that which indeed transcends all knowledge,

[1] The miraculous conception through the Holy Ghost He passes over in silence, never mentioning it in express word; and this of itself is an argument against the zealots who would insert *this clause* formally in the ordination formulary of the Prussian state-church! It is a truth which faith must find, not as the first thing but as the last deep mystery, the consciousness and confession of which it is well known came late to the Apostles and first Christians.—It is quite true, nevertheless, as Hess remarks that in these farewell discourses the idea of an *earthly father* is utterly and infinitely distant. "The disciples hearing these sayings could never have entertained the thought of—a son of Joseph!" To give prominence to those plain doctrines of salvation which are made prominent in apostolical teaching; and to hold in reserve what it held in reserve, and after the example of Jesus scarcely uttered, because it must be the necessary *consequence* of a living faith, and only *as such* is of eternal importance—cannot be altogether wrong for us *in our time*.

Hosted by Google

as we shall presently see in the case of the disciples. But if the Socinians (as Bengel says) take this entire testimony, which beamed on the disciples themselves with perfect clearness, as itself no other than a παροιμία—*we*, in opposition to the Socinians of all times, understand it better, as *the Spirit* has sealed to us its meaning.

Very touching in its simplicity is the last interruption or rejoinder of *the disciples;* so represented by St John because the speaker, whoever he was, expressed the feeling of all. "They think now, we cannot tell why, that the mystery of His person and His words is fully solved" (Nitzsch). But we do know the reason in part: the so gracious assurance that *the Father Himself loved them* has comforted their hearts, so that they take courage to think that they *understand;* their hearts know with most absolute confidence that *they love Jesus*, and when Jesus now with equal confidence attributes to them faith—how should they not be convinced by His testimony that they *do believe?* Their πιστεύομεν is by no means the error or the self-deception in their words; they may very certainly say what they do, for they only echo what He had said in their hearing and attributed to them in ver. 27—ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθες.[1] But they do not dare to commit themselves to the whole of ver. 28; although they have just declared this saying to be plain they are far from adding the further response—that Thou goest to the Father! In their simple *from God* now as before they seize rightly the fundamental truth—and this the Lord confirms and commends with joy. But as it regards all the rest, the declaration which they see fit to make before the confession of their faith, but which they would have done better to omit, is such evidence of the infirmity of their present understanding as justifies Augustine's remark—usque adeo non intelligunt, ut nec saltem se non intelligere intelligant. They do not speak about these final παροιμίαις precisely in the same manner as they spoke about the earlier παραβολαῖς in Matt. xiii. 51; for they admit that they do not yet understand the παροιμίας, though with the same self-

[1] Hence it is altogether wrong to regard them as understanding it merely in the Jewish sense of chap. iii. 2. Whether (as Luthardt thinks) they lower the meaning by putting ἀπό for ἐξ depends upon the reading which we have already considered. They certainly repeat ἐξῆλθες.

Hosted by Google

deception as on that occasion they think they understand the last words. The hour, to which the Lord had referred, appears to them already come—notwithstanding that He had expressly said that He still spoke *for the present* in parables. They thus seem to correct in their innocence their Master's word—O no, Thou hast thought too slightly of us; see, we understand Thee already! Lampe: "They are sorry because they are deemed so unapt by their Master, who thinks that they understand not His discourses but need another teacher. Hence they go so far as to contradict Christ, and invert His plainest words, denying that He had spoken in a mysterious manner." This last is far too much, since the disciples refer in their *now* expressly to the last word, vers. 26–28, as spoken *παῤῥησία, plainly;* but the *contradiction* must remain. Finally, and this is the strangest thing in their words, they assign as the *reason* of their *believing* (which unconsciously to themselves has a better reason!) by *ἐν τουτῷ* something entirely beside the purpose, something suggested by their reflection at the moment, and which moreover itself rests upon a misunderstanding. "That Jesus in an unexpected manner Himself expresses what they have long felt, that His words were deeply mysterious for their understanding—*this circumstance* they adduce as the confirmation (rather the new and decisive reason) of their believing." (Tholuck.) Just as if one should joyfully say, I now understand thee, for thou hast told me that I understand thee not! Is then their ignorance itself the foundation of their faith? The confusion in which they speak is so great that we cannot educe any clear idea from their words; but the sincere goodness of heart which holds fast to something supposed to be understood, redeems them from their folly. The Lord had spoken of a day in which they should *ask nothing:* they think this day already come, and interpret the not asking in a quite different way. We cannot see (with Lücke) how this was "no misunderstanding of His word, but a subtle application given to them;" especially when he admits that the "over-estimation of their great present privileges was their only error"—an error, indeed, this which was very great, and lying at the foundation of all! Now know we, that is, now we understand Thee, and the meaning of Thy words: that Thou knowest all things and needest not that any man should ask

Hosted by Google

Thee![1] This is no more an express attribution of Divine omniscience (as the systematic divines have derived from it), than was Peter's word afterwards, chap. xxi. 17. It is a deep presentiment, which became more and more clear during the forty days, and finally found its full expression in Acts i. 24. They mean, however, as much as this (Meyer), "that Thou discernest thoughts and anticipatest questions"—thinking, doubtless, of ver. 19. *All* other teachers must be diligently *questioned* by their disciples, if they would enter into their condition of mind and effectually *teach* them[2]—but He who came out from God *needed* this not. As they thus *invert* the Lord's word in ver. 23—For He had spoken of *their* not needing any longer to ask—they would in fact assert (by a very unwarranted anticipation)—Thou speakest now so plainly, tellest us so clearly unasked what is in our hearts, that *we also* have no need to ask Thee anything.

Ver. 31. The disentangling of all these mistakes and this confusion would have then been a profitless task:—and the day of the Spirit was coming, the revelation of which alone enabled even St John so aptly to describe that former obscurity of their understanding. The Lord passes it all by, and confines Himself to their πιστεύομεν, regarding that with the utmost graciousness and even with joy as a genuine germ, and *confirming* it as the result of His life and teaching. Or does He deny even that? The damping tone of the following verse has misled many into making this ἄρτι πιστεύετε a *question*. So many MSS., and Euthymius, and among the moderns Olshausen, who concisely decides, "Certainly it is more correct," and B.-Crusius, with equal confidence, "A question, as in ch. i. 51"—which passage, however, as our exposition shows, is no question at all. Pfenninger was similarly misled, and myself in earlier life.[3] De Wette's and Allioli's translations make it a question, and the Heb. New Testament unhappily has the ה interrogative. Lücke was first inclined to this—adducing besides ch. i. 51 the more

[1] The construction of the ἵνα with the Indic. is not unfrequent, as we know, in the New Testament.

[2] Hence the proposition which Eichhorn suggested in vain, as to the conduct of academical examinations, might be very useful if not absolutely necessary!

[3] Der Brief Jacobi, S. 9.

Hosted by Google

appropriate ch. xiii. 38—but he afterward corrected himself, doubting whether "Jesus would so lightly quench the smoking flax." This reason against the question is a good one, but far from being sufficiently strong or profound; Lampe's assertion that it comes to the same thing in the end is rash, for a deep insight into the whole train of the connection must show the interrogation to be altogether inadmissible. Tholuck lays much stress upon the *now*, as proving the words to be affirmative; he is much more justified in saying that "the disciples' really having faith cannot be doubted." Does not the whole of ch. xvii. most solemnly attribute this to them, and give *testimony* to their believing? And could the same John who wrote ch. ii. 11, and recorded ch. vi. 69, now be supposed to declare that the Lord at the close of all still doubted the faith of His eleven? Can *that* be thought possible as the result of all His labour upon them? Compare, moreover, Matt. xvi. 17, 18. It had been the aim and object of the whole prophetic ministry of Jesus to make some disciples (not the Apostles alone) susceptible for the coming of the Spirit of truth and the benefits of His passion, laying in them the foundation of faith in His own person;—and was this not attained at the end of all, was it even still a questionable thing? After such an expression of doubt could He have gone on to pray for them as in ch. xvii.?—Let all this be well pondered, and the note of interrogation will certainly be renounced as *impossible!* Nor is the most distant irony[1] to be assumed in this earnest and frank Indicative; the ἀληθῶς of ch. xvii. 18 decides against this. The Lord must be regarded as uttering this πιστεύετε with *gladness;* His joy beholding prospectively the ultimate breaking forth of the surviving germ of their faith, and therefore not disturbed by its present weakness. It is only *for the disciples' sake* that He adds ver. 32, in order that His prediction of the heavy hour of pressure might prepare them for it and help them through, humbling them now that their faith might be purified and strengthened.[2] The *now*,[3]

[1] As many suppose, admitting the Indicative. There was one arrogant prater who even represented the Lord as saying this "*with a smile of pity!*"

[2] Rieger: To keep the smoking flax from being quenched in the darkness: they would be able to say—He foretold us all this.

[3] Bengel is far-fetched here—Your faith is ἄρτιος, perfect, apt.

Hosted by Google

consequently, when we think here at the close of the beginning of the discourse, appears in its retrospective reference to indicate an *end attained*, expressed with strong emphasis at this solemn crisis; it is "the great issue of His labours upon them, expressed in one definite word" (Lange). And *not till then* does it assume a prospective reference, the end attained being regarded now as no other than a weak beginning. To regard, with Luthardt, this latter as the only sense ("for the present—but soon!"), is to us absolutely wrong, and altogether out of keeping with the solemnity of this great crisis. The emphasis of ἄρτι, standing at the beginning of the sense, points rather backward than forward, though the latter must be regarded as necessarily involved. *So far* we cannot exclude from the ἄρτι the *gentle blame* that the disciples in their confident πιστεύομεν thought too little of the testing future and the often predicted *hour of trial*. But, for the rest, the πιστεύετε which the Lord simply repeats, without any addition, would say—Yea, ye do now believe *in God and in Me;* for this was essentially contained, though undeveloped, in their ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθες.

Ver. 32. *Behold*—the Lord has already before His eyes the sight of His little circle of disciples severed as branches, *scattered* as driven sheep! The Lord refers to the same prophecy of Zechariah which He expressly cites in Matt. xxvi. 31; we shall give the exposition of it in the next volume. Similarly in John x. 13, it was said of the coming wolf, σκορπίζει τὰ πρόβατα. This fleeing of the disciples when Jesus was taken was assuredly, as the Lord in Matt. xxvi. 31 and here also regards it, an expression of their faith's weakness, a σκανδαλίζεσθαι, *a leaving Him*, Matt. xxvi. 56 (as here ἀφῆτε). One betrays, one denies, *all* the others (ἕκαστος) leave Him too by a kind of denial. Hence εἰς τὰ ἴδια as corresponding with this must have an intensive meaning; not merely being the obvious qualification of *scattered*,[1] but as it were the abandonment of their following and the retracing of their steps. Bengel says well: εἰς τὰ ἴδια, to the things which ye before left for My sake. We have not

[1] Vatablus: to the place where each might regard himself safe. Grotius: each in his *hiding-place*, for ἴδιον is said also of the place where any one retires for a time. Lampe follows these, and compares 1 Macc. vi. 54, ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ, so that the ἴδια here are consueta discipulorum, quæ

Hosted by Google

to ask, what and where these ἴδια externally were, whether in Jerusalem or Galilee (comp. ch. xix. 27, or πρὸς ἑαυτούς, ch. xx. 10)—but the external gives here its signification to the internal; whosoever leaves the Lord, returns back into himself and to his own things. This, however, is but one side; for on the other hand this fleeing of the disciples was permitted to them, since they availed not to succour Him who trode the wine-press *alone* (Isa. lxiii. 3); indeed it was, when the hour came, indirectly commanded to them, Jno. xviii. 8. Their *faith* by no means utterly ceased in this time of scattering; it approved itself as opposed to the world sufficiently strong to carry them through their distress as sheep without a shepherd.

The Lord immediately passes from the terrifying μόνον ἀφῆτε into a tone of *consolation*. That which He had intimated to the Jews, ch. viii. 29, He now openly declares to the disciples, with reference especially to that heavy hour. Then was the Lord *alone*, abandoned of all human consolation and help in the midst of the bands of the wicked; and this abandonment was to Him a grief, the scattering of His disciples was a deeply penetrating pang, one co-operating element in His lot to bear all our sin and carry all our infirmity. But *the Father*, without whom and independent of whom the Son cannot be without losing Himself (ch. viii. 16)—left Him not alone, was and did abide *with Him*. How this is to be reconciled with and modifies the abandonment by God upon the cross, we shall see when our exposition reaches that place. Let us here, in transition to the following verse, mark how all this is a type for the entire future of the church. Often is this scattering of the disciples from His presence repeated, in various degrees and with various manifestations, but He is not alone. And even if in this day all men were to leave Him—which is of course only supposition—He abides what He is, and the Father is with Him! *His holy cause can never be forsaken or lost*—as Nitzsch preaches. Calvin thus remarks: Whosoever well ponders this will hold firm his faith though the world shake, nor will the defection of

Hierosolymis habebant, hospitia. Hirsch. Bib.: "to the place which each could first find in his perplexity." The Heb. N. T. has לְבֵיתוֹ—which does not by any means exhaust the expression.

Hosted by Google

all others overturn his confidence; we do not render God His full honour, unless He alone is felt to be sufficient to us.

Ver. 33. The Lord here finally, contemplating still the end of all in His typical-perspective glance, comprehends in one the immediate sequel (ver. 32, *καὶ νῦν ἐλήλυθεν* is doubtless genuine) and the entire future of His disciples while they are found *in the world.* In these last words He "condenses the sum of the instruction which He had ministered to the disciples at the last supper."[1] In *εἰρήνην ἔχειν* He embraces the aim and the fruit of His discourses in one,[2] and we may refer to what was said upon this deep word at ch. xiv. 27; the antithesis with *θλῖψις* here, however, makes prominent the idea of confidence, assurance, and joyfulness in a *salvation* which was already sure, and which would afterward be complete. There is for His own, as for all the world, no other peace than that which is *in Him.* This is to be understood in the full depth of meaning of the vine-similitude, which has another echo here; not, however, in the sense of a rigorous demand of perfect faith in Him and union with Him. The weak and dispersed disciples who forsake Him retain so far their peace as they are not therefore forsaken of Him, and they should find their peace again as soon as they find Him again; rather, when He who does not leave them comes to them again. If *His words* (*ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν*) abide in us, that of itself assures our abiding upon and in Him (ch. xv. 7); we may say, generally, with Luther, that the peace of faith springs from the *word* embraced and held fast, depends upon it alone. "My repose and peace stand in nothing but what my Lord Christ *speaks*, as in Ps. cxix. 165, Great peace have they who love Thy word!" That is, with Luther's qualification, "provided that the word has its firm place *in the heart.*" As long as we are *in the world* trials and temptations not yet overcome are perfectly consistent with this —and this, indeed, is the highest consolation, as seen in the *ἀλλὰ θαρσεῖτε*, without which the concluding with *ἐν ἐμοὶ εἰρήνην* would have left us in only greater dismay. "He acknowledges that we in the world must have tribulation, but

[1] Nitzsch, zweite Auswahl, S. 113.

[2] Pfenninger, generally so useful to the expositor, here strangely interprets, "that ye may be without anxiety concerning Me!"

Hosted by Google

He encourages us at the same time by the assurance of peace in Him. *He is not alone, and leaveth not alone.*" (Nitzsch.) Not even then when we have to cry after Him, " Why hast Thou forsaken me!"

Θλίψιν ἔχετε we prefer with Griesbach, Scholz, Knapp, Schott, Matthäi, though Lachmann holds to the ἕξετε of the Text. Rec.; Erasmus corrected the Vulg. *habebitis* into *habetis*. The present indicates the continuous and abiding condition of His disciples—Ye *are* in the world, therefore ye *have* tribulation. But let it be carefully noted to what extent the *in the world* is opposed to the *in Me*, in order that we may see clearly that the words do not refer *merely* to *external* trial. (Neander: of their living in *external* contact with the world, which imposes manifold affliction upon the *external* man.) *Tribulation* is certainly not alone " the violence and enmity of the world, which causes grief and anxiety to the disciples"—their διώκειν and πειράζειν. For all this would not interrupt our peace, if the persecution did not meet with and excite weakness of faith, and the temptation sinful desire, *in us*. So much as the world has still in us, and the ἐν ἐμοί is consequently not yet perfect, so much is there lacking or inimical to our peace. We must call to mind the θλίψις of the woman in childbirth, a tribulation from within and of herself; and mark the opposites, εἰρήνη, θαρσεῖν,—in order to perceive the inappropriateness of a merely external interpretation of the word. The world not only *persecutes*, it *tempts* also, yea it leads us still to the σκορπίζεσθαι and σκανδαλίζεσθαι, to the partial and temporary abandonment of our Lord; and thus it confounds us and thereby *takes away our courage*. Again, the *tribulation* itself which the world and sin cause to those who cannot any longer joy or even be contented in the world and sin, is an encouraging effect of faith; the Lord could never say to *His disciples*—In the world ye have peace! When that is the case, His word and consolation have no more place in us. " This tribulation in the world is the sole evidence of our *heterogeneity*"—writes Hamann, comforting himself, to Herder: instead of the exaggerated and doubtful " *sole* evidence," we would rather say, the *first* and the *abiding* evidence. And here holds good the θαρσεῖτε, the final and highest expression of which, concentrating in itself all

Hosted by Google

the previous and subsequent consolations of Scripture, is *here* uttered by the lips of the Redeemer Himself, who *for us* surrendered Himself to tribulation:—He who can lay hold of *that* word, and make it a reality, has the second and complementary evidence for his full assurance that he is in Christ and no longer of the world. *The two are united*, the tribulation and the peace; yet so that the peace continually has the better, realising the θαρσεῖν, and the εἰρήνην ἔχειν holds its full force:—this is the signature of the disciples in their present state. For—"the Lord speaks of that which lies *in the interim*," that is, between the beginning and the consummation of their discipleship.

But He Himself, the author and finisher of faith, to whom we look in order to run with patience the race of conflict which still lies before us—has overcome! As the *prince* of this world (according to ch. xiv. 30) has been baffled in Him, so consequently and most assuredly is *the world* also with all its still blustering adherence to the discomfited enemy, the judged usurper.[1] Christ has overcome *in the same way* of suffering, and obedience, and even temptation; He indeed *without sin*, but even that is imputed to us and appropriated by us in faith. He anticipates here the νενίκηκα before He has reached Gethsemane and Golgotha—and how should this word stimulate us, uttered now from above! So our faith in Him is the victory which has already overcome the world. (1 Jno. v. 4.) "The conflict and suffering which *we* now have, is not the real war, but only the celebration, a part of the glory, of this *victory*." (Luther.) Is the world still essentially the same—Christ also is the same! That is, as the Eternal One who contended and won for us in our flesh—not as our modern folly perverts His word, See how gloriously I, a firm child of humanity, overcome, be bold also yourselves and do the like! But our θαρσεῖν comes only from the ἐν ἐμοί, from the ἐγὼ νενίκηκα; and we utter boldly St John's question still in the hearing of all

[1] Bengel remarks on ch. xiv. 30: Hic principem mundi amolitur Jesus; alterâ colloquii hujus parte finiente, mundum, c. xvi. 33. Zinzendorf, too much in the manner of those who attach edifying thoughts to the word without true exposition, shows on "the overcoming the world" how the Saviour won the human race with love and good deeds, making the wicked His friends!

Hosted by Google

—*Who is he*, where is there one, that overcometh the world, *except he that believeth* that Jesus is the Son of God?—Let us close with the beautiful and profound word of Nitzsch, "in Him all overcome who rejoice to be the world overcome by Him." For assuredly, even in *this* sense, as we otherwise know, He alone is the Overcomer.

THE HIGH-PRIESTLY PRAYER.

(Ch. xvii.)

Ταῦτα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς—the Evangelist plainly combines in one historical whole all previous "ταῦτα λελάληκα" which he has recorded; and now begins with a new καὶ εἶπε, adding another simple and sublime historical note—that Jesus then, thus speaking, before his, the Evangelist's eyes, lifted up His own eyes to heaven. All that can be said for the historically certain truth of the entire Gospel, and that applies to its actual reproduction of our Lord's sayings, so wonderfully yet so naturally effected by the Holy Ghost;—all that has been said in defence of this a thousand times by orthodox expositors with more or less confidence and wisdom, may be applied with all the greater force to this *Prayer*, inasmuch as it is the climax and consummation of all His discourses, pressing nearest to heaven and most immediately breathing of its mysteries,—a triumphantly and serenely bright *It is finished* before the darkness surrounded Him upon the cross, so that that must be first rightly interpreted by this! Words which none but the only begotten of the Father could ever utter; and which could never have entered the heart of man if they had not been actually spoken by Him! A final testimony to Himself on the part of the Son, uttered before the Father and to the Father Himself alone; a most sacred and *pleading* expression of the inmost reality of that self-consciousness in which He alone knew who Himself was, One with the One above in heaven! A more awful and convincing attestation to the listening disciples, and to all Christian men who hear while they read, and read while they hear, than any Ἀμὴν Ἀμήν which could fall from His lips, than any oath which might

Hosted by Google

attest His—I Jesus am He, the *Christ*, the *Son* of the Blessed! —"*Father!*" This is the testimony of the Son, who in a transcendent sense makes His own that distantly typical word of a traduced sufferer (Job xvi. 17–19)—No injustice is in Mine hands, My prayer also is pure—O earth, cover not thou My blood!—behold, My witness is in heaven, and He who knoweth Me is on high!—"Father! Thou knowest Me! Thou understandest Me! Righteous Father! the world knoweth Thee not, *but I know Thee*"—thus testifies *the Son*. We who by His grace believe on Him may leave to fools the folly of discussing in their hearts or in their books whether Jesus actually and literally did thus pray! That which to their folly is "conceivable," that some other might have afterwards invented, arranged, or worked up—not merely with incredible audacity, but with still more incredible correctness and insight—such a prayer as this out of some pre-existent materials, is to us, in proportion to the measure of our faith, more and more evidently the most inconceivable of all impossibilities. "Every one of these words could have been spoken by Him alone, and by Him only at such a conjuncture." (Theremin.) Therefore "we cannot thankfully enough wonder at and magnify the goodness of God, which hath taken care that one of the prayers in which the Son of God poured out His heart to the Father should be so carefully communicated to us." All sophistical questioning as to the process of St John's remembrance and the relation of his own spirit in the matter, may be rebutted by the counter-question—How could this disciple, paying his own homage to the Lord, have presumed to place in His lips by an εἶπεν the words of his own spirit? We make bold to obviate one offence of foolishness by another, and say, If Jeremiah formerly could dictate over again to Baruch his scribe the words of the roll which Jehoiakim burned—might not the Lord of glory have given to His beloved disciple the pen of the Spirit, that he should faithfully reproduce and record the prayers which He had offered up for His church to the end of time? Alas, alas, we detect in most even of our orthodox expositors, the simplicity of whose faith is confused by the unbelief of the falsely learned, a tendency scarcely concealed to assume even in this chapter the composition and arrangement of St John's own mind. To Lücke "the

Hosted by Google

τῇ δόξῃ ᾗ εἶχον (ver. 5), flows from the gnosis of the *Evangelist*" — and attempting to solve a supposed contradiction here, he says, "*John* distinguishes between the eternal and the temporal δόξα!" Treating of the order of thought, vers. 25, 26, he proceeds, "Who can imagine that *John* merely, etc.?"[1] Olshausen thinks it enough to indicate "*that the author of the Gospel*, as everywhere so here, does not conceal *his idea* of the Divine nature of Christ." And much else like this might be quoted to be condemned. We, for our own part—and this is our testimony and avowal in common with the Church, which sets its seal to this Gospel in ch. xxi. 24, and seals it still—should feel ourselves reproved in the utterance of such expressions by the Spirit of truth, as guilty of the ἁμαρτία of οὐ πιστεύειν in the sense of ch. xvi. 9. We say with Braune, and more decidedly than he, "Does not Jesus pray at the end in the language of John? I would almost add—so Christly has become the language of this disciple of His heart, so thoroughly has he imbibed his Lord's spirit and style of thought." Yes, verily, that which is now called Johannæan was first Christly—whence else could it have come? The glorification-prayer did not spring from the gnosis of the prologue; but this prologue, which gives us not the gnosis of man but the witness of God, sprang from this prayer, from the self-testimony of the Only-begotten reaching its culmination in the petitions which, *in these words*, He offered up in the flesh.

On the καὶ εἶπε Augustin writes: Poterat Dominus noster unigenitus et coæternus Patri in forma servi et ex forma servi, si hoc opus esset, orare silentio: sed ita se Patri exhibere voluit precatorem, *ut meminisset, nostrum se esse doctorem.* Proinde eam, quam fecit, orationem pro nobis, *notam fecit et nobis:* quoniam tanti magistri non solum apud ipsos sermocinatio, sed etiam ipsius pro ipsis ad Patrem oratio *discipulorum est ædificatio.* Et si illorum, qui hæc dicta aderant audituri, profecto et nostra qui fueramus *conscripta lecturi.*[2] And Bengel's briefer and more

[1] "This is eternal life, *says John*, that they might know Thee and Him whom Thou hast sent—!" Thus Schenkel. With all brotherly respect for a man who has so much advanced in soundness and true zeal since 1839, I cannot but refer to this striking example.

[2] This last means, *When* He thus prayed He did not speak to the wind, but provided for the permanence of His words for posterity.

Hosted by Google

pointed expression of the same thing, is most obviously correct —orat Patrem simulque discipulos *docet*. Which design of this praying and speaking aloud is literally expressed in ver. 13. This *docet* was not merely "the natural result," as Lücke maintains, though in opposition to this verse, but *at the same time* the actual *design* of our Lord; *simul*, as Bengel says, more discreetly than Lampe, who goes too far when he interprets, *Not so much* for His own sake as for theirs; and applies this still more incorrectly when he regards vers. 1–5 as spoken *only* for the disciples' instruction. Most assuredly this was not the case, but He teaches and edifies the disciples by admitting them to look into His praying heart; consequently it is actually *His heart* which prays also on His own account *in the presence of the Father*. Concerning this blending of prayer for self with a regard to men who hear —in its perfection possible only to the Son—we have already spoken, when at the grave of Lazarus.[1]

Luther bids us, in order to a right understanding of these simple yet inexhaustible words, to consider, "Who the Man is that thus prays, and Who is prayed unto, and how great a thing is prayed for." Melancthon declares, nec digniorem, nec sanctiorem, nec fructuosiorem nec magis patheticam vocem in cœlo ac terra unquam auditam fuisse, quam hanc ipsius Filii Dei precationem. Bengel testifies, hoc caput in tota scriptura est verbis facillimum, sensibus profundissimum. Spener avows, "that the true understanding of this prayer goes beyond the measure of faith which the Lord is wont to impart to His disciples during their pilgrimage." Therefore when he drew near the end of his own pilgrimage, he caused it to be read three times aloud to him, but never ventured to preach upon it. We have, however, expository preachers upon it in abundance; and many called and uncalled have made their essays upon its interpretation. May we not, nay, ought we not to add our attempt? Although it goes beyond our understanding—like much else, indeed everything, in Scripture—yet it is enshrined there that we may ponder it, with the help of the same Spirit who gave to St John that

[1] It is sufficiently plain from the tenor of both fact and narrative, that the Lord did not go apart to pray, as His wont was, *John alone* being near enough to hear His words.

Hosted by Google

deep insight with which he wrote it down, and Who is promised also to us.

The incomparable and crystalline simplicity of the words of this prayer is a very great assistance to our understanding of its meaning, alluring us to penetrate the deep things which they so plainly utter. The Lord manifestly would be understood, and therefore speaks of the highest wonders and mysteries with such marvellous plainness of speech as is never found in the gnostic or speculatist, and can never be attained even by His servants praying through His Spirit in His name. So high is its strain that none has ever approached it since; and yet the words are so childlike that children find their instruction, and edification, and comfort in them. To Strauss this wonderful chapter presents itself, not as a prayer, but as a product of reflection, as a discourse concerning Jesus: but he knows not what praying is, at least what the prayer of the Son of God is in that glory and illumination, which He already anticipates while He asks for it. "Should it be wondered at that perfected *feeling* is throughout most intense *thought?*" says Lange beautifully. Less striking, but with equally sound meaning, is Braune's remark, "Here is the inwardness of the East, the home of religion, seized and expressed with the precision of the West, the home of science." We would make this more emphatic, and say, The most glowing mystic and the most careful thinker finds each his own language in these words, embracing both opposites in one! We can form some slight conception of the intensity of emotion with which the human heart of our Lord would at this crisis vibrate to the truth, the essential reality of the things of which He spoke—and hence the discourse which utters them bubbles forth as a gushing stream. And again, what majestic repose, what luminous transparency of the thoughts, one flowing from the other in adjusted order, all forming one connected development, and for the most part each one either the explanation of what precedes it, or a further deduction of its consequences.

And may we presume to analyse such a prayer as this? Yes, for being *such* it must have the most perfect and exact arrangement and system, adjusted down to the minutest point—could we but seize it aright! The more of spirit and life there is in prayer, the more will there be of the living system of the Spirit

Hosted by Google

in its organic development; but it is better to arrive at this by an inward sympathy with the process of the prayer, praying it after Him, than to impose upon it a system from without, in derogation of its sanctity. We shall therefore content ourselves with a very general preparatory analysis of the whole; and when after that we enter upon detailed exposition, every single word will itself guide us to the next. Thus much is at once clear: The Lord, approaching the Father as His Son, proceeds from *Himself* and His glorification now come, laying claim on that account to eternal life for all given to Him;—He then as Intercessor embraces all His disciples present and future—beginning with the commencement of His work within them, and continually enlarging the circle of His intercession until it reaches eternity and the full consummation of all;—and, finally, He carries back their glorification with becoming dignity to the first words concerning His own—*I in them!* This prayer has been termed with perfect propriety the *High-priestly* prayer: not merely vers. 9 and 19, but the entire strain approves this. He prayed thus *in testimony how He would henceforth intercede for and represent them in heaven.* The beginning of the High Priest's office is, in the living transition of the unity of all the offices, the end also of the prophetic.

There is, indeed, as Schmieder[1] observes, a distinction, but it is not, we think, an essential one, between this present *intercession* and His future *mediation.* It is not by an "inexact" use of the term that the church calls the Lord's mediation now in heaven an intercession; this language is justified as exhibiting and bringing home to us heavenly things by earthly types. That we do not now ask, Lord Jesus, pray for us! is partly untrue, since many of our hymns and prayers do use such language; but partly the result of an internal restraint of propriety.

The three main divisions are so simple and so plain, that this trichotomy has been generally acknowledged from the earliest times; their more detailed organisation will appear as we proceed. *First* is the supplication to the Father for the glorification of the Son, as the ground and summary of the whole,—*Δόξασόν με, σὺ πάτερ!* But with this is connected the instructive expla-

[1] In his profound, but rather theosophically contemplative than expository, treatise on the High-priestly prayer (Hamburg 1848) S. 123.

Hosted by Google

nation, preparing for what follows, that from the *knowledge* of God the Father in the Son glorifying and glorified by Him, the *eternal life* of believers should proceed. This is embraced and concluded in vers. 1–5. *Secondly* follows the specific *intercession* for His own whom He *leaves behind* in the world, commencing with the revelation of the name and communication of the word which had already been vouchsafed, and proceeding through preservation unto holiness in the truth—embracing indeed with these first disciples all future disciples too. (Vers. 6–19.) Here we have, further, in vers. 6–13, a more general foundation with its own definite conclusion; ver. 14 beginning anew with a more deeply penetrating development of the expression.[1] *In the third place* follows, from ver. 20 ("*not for these alone*" looks backward also in its application) to the close, *the widest comprehension* of His whole church—all *one* in Him, as He in the Father, partakers finally of His *glory*, as they were previously, and as the foundation for that, of His *love*.

The arrangement of Olshausen and Lücke makes vers. 1–8 the first part, and certainly vers. 6–8 contain a general fundamental statement which flows immediately from the preceding; but as certainly the intercession for His own who have received and held fast His word, is already begun in them. Lampe would resolve it into an oratio *bipartita*, the division being between vers. 10 and 11—the former part laying the foundation, and the latter being the detailed development. We are far from contending about it, and leave to every one his own view; it is manifest that in the fulness of this prayer many various organic arrangements may be found interpenetrating each other.[2] Very

[1] Melancthon finds *four* essential things prayed for on behalf of His church: the first and most prominent being the conservation of true doctrine, concord the second, then the full application of His sacrificial merit, and lastly joy and eternal glory. We regard, however, the first as the foundation presupposed in vers. 6–11. The τηρεῖν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι has obviously a wider meaning; their *preservation*, as in ver. 15, is the proper *centre* of the intercession (as Lampe rightly regards it), but this is effected only in their *sanctification*.

[2] Schmieder speaks at first of *six* petitions, vers. 5, 11, 15, 17, 20, 24. But he afterwards in his exposition adds to the one great supplication for Himself which embraces all, three others for His disciples; more correctly taking vers. 20–23 as one additional.

Hosted by Google

much more important than any arbitrary arrangement is it that we should contemplate, feel, wonder at, adore, and in adoring at the same time understand, the most sacred, sinless, and spotless *illumination* and *repose* with which the unspotted High Priest, now near the anguish of Gethsemane, presents Himself here before the Father. What a contrast is this, and what a revelation does this light and glory shed upon that subsequent obscuration![1] No word of *sin* and guilt, with which, however, every other son of man must appear before God in death. Not even a word of infirmity, no *Help Me!* all is merged into the one *Glorify Thou Me!* Nor is there even a *thanksgiving* at the end of the accomplished work, only the testimony—I have finished the work, Thou gavest it to Me! One great *petition*—and that for things which, according to human thought and worldly estimate, would be the most improbable of all on such an occasion—and even this is scarcely a *petition*, for He who humbles Himself to ask it places Himself, unlike every other petitioner, by the side of the Father—*We!* (vers. 11, 22), and speaks thus of the giving of eternal glory, Father, *I will!* ver. 24. Again, for that which is from eternity His own He nevertheless *prays!* Where else are such marvels found? Who can sound the depths of all this?

Ver. 1. We cannot admit the reading καὶ ἐπάρας,—εἶπε, which Griesb., Lachmann, and Tisch. have accepted; Lücke regards it as a mere correction of the style, but we set it down as a correction which would exchange the emphatic simplicity of the rigorously historical opening for a descriptive effect which is quite inappropriate to St John. He does not even lift up His *hands* toward heaven, like other earnest petitioners who urge their suit: that would have been unsuitable to the repose and majesty of this prayer, in which He exhibits Himself as One with the Father, and as having at once that which He asks. But He lifts up His *eyes*, in testimony where His heart is, and whither He is going. Toward *heaven*, for although the Father and heaven itself are at the same time within Him, yet on the other hand the throne of glory is not the less there on high. Many make this a reason for thinking that the prayer

[1] Rupert's notion is inconceivable, that *this* prayer was that offered in Gethsemane!

Hosted by Google

was offered up on the way, in the open road, but we have already refuted this.[1] The heaven toward which Jesus looked is not so much the visible heaven (in which "the bright full moon was shining") as the invisible (Col. i. 16).[2] Nor did the Lord praying within the chamber need any "open window" in order to look towards heaven—as some have tamely imagined. Lücke well exposes this, "To the praying eye heaven, the throne of God, is everywhere visible, comp. Ps. cxxiii. 1." But what Schmieder says here of the heaven within the praying soul is only a meditation upon the words, and not an exposition of them. The *first* word of the praying Lord is, *Father*—and nothing more. Not *our* Father, which He could never say; not even *My* Father, for that would be here too much. In the entire prayer there are six invocations; twice with this word in its bare simplicity, twice with *σὺ πάτερ* corresponding to the adjoined *I;* once *πάτερ ἅγιε*, and once finally *πάτερ δίκαιε*. The hour is come—so speaks the Son to the all-knowing Father in the real address of person to person, presenting Himself in this first word as ready in His voluntary will for this glorification. Come is *the hour*—this connects itself closely with ch. xii. 23, 28; as the *glorifying* which follows connects itself with ch. xiii. 31, 32. Yet the thought of the glorification hastens most distinctly over the hour of suffering, and forward to the state of glory in heaven, ver. 5: it is throughout one and the same glorification of which He speaks. The *first petition* is the preliminary expression of the substance of the whole, out of which all is unfolded, into which all returns back. *Glorify—Me!* As the *hour* is specifically mentioned, Luther is right in saying, "He prays with such feeling and solemnity as if He *already hung upon the cross*, as if He should cry,—I am now in the very midst of shame and death, lying in deepest darkness, *the time is come* that I should be lifted up, and set in honour." But it is just as true, and of as deep significance, that He thus prays in the clear consciousness of the anticipated *νενίκηκα*, and

[1] I can only marvel to find Schmieder saying, "Thus went Jesus, in colloquy with the Father, through the silent streets of Jerusalem, etc." My thought can represent the High Priest "standing before God," neither as *going* nor as *sitting*.

[2] Alford's English excellently expresses it—*Heaven* is not the *sky*.

Hosted by Google

that He cannot therefore cry first σῶσόν με. Here in the Father's presence He terms Himself not the Son of man, although the glorification of the human nature is here concerned, the Divine needing no glorification; for it is *upon the ground and prerogative of the equal Godhead united to His humanity, that He prays in this humanity.* Throughout the prayer we find the most complete *communicatio idiomatum.* There has been already in the past an ἐδόξασα of the Father (ch. xii. 28); but the full and perfect glorification is now first to come. He begins by referring to Himself as *objectively presented* to His own faith and contemplation—*Thy Son;* but this is in vers. 4, 5, retracted into the subjective I and Me, while the I and Thou then pave the way for the still more exalted *We*, of ver. 11. That Thy Son also may glorify Thee: —even in this juxtaposition and reciprocation there is decisive testimony to the *equal Divinity* of the Son; for what creature could presume to say before the throne and face of the Creator, that it would glorify Him *as* He it. The καί, wanting in the Vulg., and rejected by Lachm., is capable of vindication, and of great significance as giving prominence to this meaning—which, however, without it would be essentially the same.

The Son, further, desires His own glorification not *egoistically*, in any imaginable sense of this word as appertaining to sin and separation from God; but solely to *the end that* He again may glorify the Father, and give back to Him the might, honour, and glory which Himself should receive, and here once more we find that first petition after the invocation of the Father in heaven, a petition which includes all others,—Hallowed by *Thy name!*[1] How and to what end, then, may and must *the Father Himself* (this absolute expression is here alone

[1] The parallel drawn in Richter's Hausbibel (on Lu. xi.), between the *entire* Lord's prayer and *this* prayer, will not hold good; for all the succeeding petitions are here merged in the first, and that only as far as the *sinless* High Priest could make them His own. Nor can it be said, strictly speaking, that the order is here reversed, this prayer beginning with glorification and *redemption*, and ending with the manifestation of the Father's *name.* For, to the Redeemer regarded as now victorious and out of the reach of all evil, the δόξασον does not include a σῶσον, and the γνωρίζειν τὸ ὄνομα at the end is something different from the *hallowing* of *our* prayer. What in that prayer, however, the Lord does use, has here its beginning.

Hosted by Google

found) first *be glorified?* It is obvious, not to and in Himself; but as the holy and righteous Father *in men*, who through *sin* have come short of His δόξα. Thus He is first of all to be glorified in the humanity of this God-man, who prepares and presents Himself to that end; then, through Him in His disciples, so that in this first word concerning the mutual glorification, that is already involved and included which follows in vers. 10, 23, 26—ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς. The glorification of the Father through the Son glorified by the Father is—"the restoration of the Divine image in humanity," the issue of which is expressed in 2 Thess. i. 10.

Ver. 2. There now follows a more specific development and explanation of the sense in which this glorification of the Father to and in fallen humanity is intended. Καθώς, as a connecting particle, has been variously regarded, the greater part of expositors perceiving the specific force of the word, but giving it a restricted instead of a general meaning. Euthymius makes it summarily a ὅτι or διό, and Grotius, somewhat nearer the point, rationem reddit præcedentium, et valet *siquidem;* for which Olshausen, too, adduces Rom. i. 28; 1 Cor. i. 6. In this sense it has been expressed thus, That Thy Son may glorify Thee *according to His destiny:* nor can it be doubted that such a meaning is primarily included—Thou hast decreed and ordered it that I should be the Saviour of all men. Rieger: "This His first petition He *supports* by the consideration that the mediatorial office which He had received required such a glorification; and that without it the good pleasure of the Lord could not prosper in His hands." Lücke, again, somewhat varies this: "The reciprocal glorification *corresponds with* the authority which the Father had given Him, etc. The *causal relation* which καθώς expresses is this, that the reciprocal glorification, the *end*, must answer to the *beginning*, the sending, the preparation, and the vocation of the Son." All this is true, but we must, however, hold fast (as Lücke seems to perceive) that both the *reason* and the corresponding *similarity* are together meant, just as in Rom. i. 28. That is however still true which B.-Crusius observes, "καθώς defines *the manner of God's glorification*, through the union of all men (*all?*) in a blessed and sanctified fellowship." So Lampe preferred to

Hosted by Google

accept the particle as συγκριτικῶς seu ἐξηγητικῶς. All this harmonises well: the rationem reddere unites both the *reason assigned* and the *object for which*, in as far as, first, the ἐξουσία is already attributed and given to the Son, and that, too, not merely as a "commission," but in the fulness of absolute power; —but then only to this end, that He may give life and save. Thus the καθώς points not only to the main proposition ἔδωκας, but to its subordinate and further scope ἵνα δώσῃ. Such is the full meaning of the transition "according as."

All flesh never means unconditionally as such *all men*, and most certainly not here! Gen. vi. 3, 12, connected with it the notion of a dying nature in its full sense as being the result of sin, as well *mortality* as *corruption;* nay, rather, made that its fundamental idea:—though sometimes, as in the case of the flesh of the Logos, the idea of a *weakness* to be overcome is all that is brought into view. See, in illustration, Lu. iii. 6; Isa. xl. 5, 6; Matt. xxiv. 22; Acts ii. 17. His *humiliation* down to the flesh of sinners and the children of death, is contemplated by Him who here prays in the weakness of His flesh but through the power of the eternal Spirit, as itself an *authority* bestowed upon Him:—in this very participation of human nature He has become the Head and the Lord of all humanity. In its final and perfect sense the power of which He speaks was not yet given to Him (see Matt. xxviii. 18)—but we must not, nevertheless, reduce the ἔδωκας here to a mere designating, or appointing, or attributing, like the Heb. נָתַן. The full vindication and practical evolution of this power remains for the approaching glorification; but on the ground of the Divinity, which dwelt in and pervaded His humanity, He possessed from the beginning of His incarnation all ἐξουσία and δόξα. This is the fundamental principle of the whole prayer, as it comes prominently out in this preliminary καθώς. In this sense, according to Matt. xi. 27, the Son had already power over *all things;* for that expression, though it primarily referred to things *to be revealed*, yet includes in its meaning the more general and deeper principle of His power. It is the propriety of the Son in His humiliation to have power over all spirits, over every creature, and that power He might use when occasion required; but now that is made prominent which concerns the import of this me-

Hosted by Google

diatorial prayer, the specific power over *all flesh*. "That is the foul matter with which Christ has to do. For all flesh is in a miserable condition, so that it might appear to have been made in vain,[1] unless such a Mediator interpose." (Berl. Bibel.) Authority over all flesh, obtained by His becoming a man in the flesh and the Head of our race, the Son received with joy from His Father—"not as a burdensome commission, but as an authority conferred." (Rieger.)

In the word *flesh* there lies involved the "inclusive idea of all tribulation and misery," as Francke rightly preaches. But we doubt very much whether, as Lange assentingly supplements, "in the same expression there is *also* the inclusive idea of all undeveloped human capabilities for the kingdom of God;" for this scriptural phrase, which we have explained upon ch. iii., seems to forbid such a view. Most certainly this material, with which Christ has to do, is not as "flesh" a fund of undeveloped capabilities, but an element of opposition, in a state of ruin and corruption altogether needing renewal. All flesh (excepting Him who even in the flesh has already the ἐξουσία) lies in death, has fallen under the power of *eternal death:* this contrast and gloomy undertone is assuredly presupposed in the fact that a giving of *eternal life* is spoken of as necessary. But even the power of the Son, according to the counsel of the Father, cannot bring to effect the eternal life of *all* flesh: the specific and prominent ἵνα distinguishes His saving power as it respects those given to Him, from the universal authority *over* all men (for this is the right resolution of the genitive here). The latter embraces, as all His working to the end that the whole world if willing may be saved, so also the condemnation which, alas, must be the alternative in the case of the many who will not; but this latter in the High-priestly prayer is merely grazed and passed by, that the salvation of those who believe may be the great theme, ver. 9. The Father *giveth* the power *over* all, but among these all He *giveth* the elect *themselves* to the Son: for here we have the opposition between the general and the particular. It must be understood that the Father hath given those who suffer themselves to be drawn and given: as we have

[1] The thought here reverts to Ps. lxxxix. 48.

Hosted by Google

sufficiently shown upon ch. vi., and as ver. 8 in this chapter fundamentally establishes.

To become such a *possession* of Jesus (2 Thess. ii. 14)—is ever the condition for the reception of eternal life. "Know this well, O man, that it is not given to thee to be thy own master: thou must have another Lord, the choice is between God and thine eternal enemy and His." (Theremin.) The threefold *giving* has a very significant internal relation, each one strictly proceeding from that which precedes it: because Christ has become the Head of humanity, believers may be given to and incorporated with Him; but to those who become such He can also fully and entirely communicate Himself. And here it must be noted that in a certain sense the honour ultimately rests with the Father alone, who *hath given* to the Son to *give;* while, on the other hand, in the second giving the independent authority of the Son is maintained. Comp. ch. v. 26, according to which the Son *hath* Himself the life, and *is* the life for us. Here then it is that *real* life which is *eternal;* that fellowship with *God* which at once begins with living faith, and is consummated only in the full blessedness of eternal glory:—such must be its meaning here, as it is communicated to us by the *Spirit* through the *glorification* of the Son. Men take needless and foolish pains to take away from this passage all reference to the present state, and eternal life this side the grave; but the opposite error is equally and even more deplorable—that, namely, of limiting it entirely to this state. He who truly hath life in the Son knows also that it will be consummated to him in eternity.

The remarkable construction with πᾶν at the beginning (*enallage* both *generis* and *numeri*—for the reading αὐτῷ, instead of αὐτοῖς, is evidently false), has been spoken of already on ch. vi. 37: all those who are given to the Son are regarded both as individuals, which the αὐτοῖς maintains, and as one complete and foreseen Whole. Thus not merely is πᾶν to be expressed by *quotquot* (with Erasmus), but it is to be regarded as corresponding with the ἵνα ὦσιν ἕν, ver. 11. And this refutes the interpretation of the Berlenb. Bibel (as does also the parallel, ch. vi.),—"That He may give them *all that which* Thou hast given Him, eternal life;" although there is nothing in the expression itself which would oppose this rendering. It evidently aims at

Hosted by Google

removing anything like an election of those given, and thereby would pave the way for the general restoration of all flesh.

V. 3. Here we have both development and expansion of the thought, by means of a more direct definition of eternal life. The expression is in some sort parallel with ch. iii. 19, And this is the condemnation—thus does it proceed. In that passage, however, the *ground* and the *way* of condemnation are expressly defined; but we must not on that account say that nothing more is meant here than the way to eternal life—This is the appointed way in which men attain to it. For the Lord here penetrates more deeply into the matter than He does there, where it was not yet His purpose to reveal the essential character of the condemnation. The ἐστίν, belonging to the ἵνα γινώσκωσι,[1] is to be understood as in ch. xii. 50 (but not likewise ch. vi. 63, which we have expounded otherwise). It is not needful that the Son should tell the Father in what eternal life consists; hence Francke is very positive that these words were spoken as instruction to those who heard Him, "I have made mention of eternal life, and will now tell *you* how ye may attain it." This, however, is too peremptory, and forgets that the ὁμολόγησις also is part of true prayer—Father, I know Thee, Thou art the only God, to know Thee is life! We have an apt parallel in Wisd. xv. 3—so apt that we might almost suppose an allusion to it—For to know Thee is perfect righteousness; yea, to know Thy power is the root of immortality. Even this apocryphal passage,—anticipating the New Testament, though the ἐπίστασθαι and the ῥίζα ἀθανασίας reach not the depth of the γινώσκειν and the ζωὴ αἰώνιος—goes beyond the superficial meaning which many, with a good intention or in condescending apologetics, derive from this utterance of our Lord. Erskine,[2] to wit: "The mystery of eternal life, holiness and blessedness, consist in the knowledge of the moral attributes of God, as they have been manifested in the work of Jesus Christ." [Germ. trans.] O no, it is not the attributes or perfections of God which are here referred to merely, but the κράτος or essence of

[1] A various reading has the indicative. Certainly ἵνα is the explicative ὅτι; not *in order that*, which by an inconceivable ὕστερον πρότερον, the eternal life would come before the knowledge of God and of Christ.

[2] Essay on Faith, translated by Krüger.

Hosted by Google

the eternal Power and Godhead itself, the most internal principle of which is the power of communicating love as the root of our eternal life. Schmieder unexpectedly explains at first, that Jesus does not declare *in what* eternal life consists, but what would make eternal life accessible to us, in what and whereby we may attain eternal life; but he afterward corrects himself, "In this *knowledge*, however, we *have* Him and in Him eternal life; for true knowledge is ever communication of influence, and leads to increasingly perfect fellowship."[1] Yes, in truth, this saying may serve to explain what *knowledge* means in Scripture! 1 Cor. viii. 2, 3, xiii. 12; Gal. iv. 9. Not apprehension, imagination, thinking in cold speculation, or feeling in the unillumined warmth of false mysticism; nor is it belief as mere admission and credence, but a living, conscious possession of fellowship with Him. *To know God*—the highest thing possible to the creature, or for which the creature was formed! When *that* is perfect, the *life* is consummate. The holy angels are from their creation blessed in this, that they behold the face of God; but we are to *receive* the knowledge of the only true God (which not more than eternal life we derive from ourselves), through Him whom He hath sent to us to that end.

God is ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός, that is not, certainly, "who faithfully fulfils His promises"—but He alone is God in the only true and absolutely real meaning of this incomprehensible name; a name which humanity never lost sight of even in its darkest idolatry, as in 1 Thess. i. 9, θεὸς ζῶν καὶ ἀληθινός. There is manifestly here a similar contrast with the "gods" falsely so called: this is proved by the corroborative μόνος, as well as by the juxtaposition of Jesus the Messiah, which gives a peculiar character to this passage. The two opposites to the knowledge of the true God here referred to, were in their historical manifestation at that time—*Gentile* idolatry, which knew not nor acknowledged even the one true God; and the *Jewish* rejection of His anointed in the person of Jesus, which nevertheless acknowledged and professed to know the only God—see, however, ch. v. 37, 38, viii. 42, 43, 54, 55. But in their internal

[1] As Iren. adv. Hær. iv. 20, Ἡ ὕπαρξις τῆς ζωῆς ἐκ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ περιγίνεται μετοχῆς· μετοχὴ δὲ θεοῦ ἐστι τὸ γινώσκειν θεὸν καὶ ἀπολαύειν τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ.

Hosted by Google

and permanent principle, as the Lord here points to it for all futurity, they are—*Pantheistic* denial of the personal supermundane Creator, and deification of the creature which is the root of all heathenism; and *Deistical* rationalism, which needs not and rejects Christ. We may regard this juxtaposition under various aspects, as history and experience furnish illustrations of its meaning. On the one hand, Christ alone is the way to the Father, and there is no knowledge of the Father apart from and independently of the Son whom He hath sent to us: and in this sense the καί is a profound explication of what precedes. And this holds good with regard to all conscious and wilful rejection of the Christ who is come, in which alienation from God and hatred to Him must infallibly manifest themselves.[1] But, on the other hand, since the whole truth in man's relations to God comes out only step by step, since men can be brought back to a knowledge of God only *by degrees*, the two parts of our saying express this progression, as it corresponds on a great scale to the relation between the Old and New Testaments—Repentance toward God and faith in Jesus Christ.[2] Assuredly, there have been and there are monotheist Jews (as even Mohammedans and Gentile Philosophers), who already possess some knowledge of the μόνος ἀληθινὸς θεός, and yet know not Christ; but this *partial* knowledge must necessarily be connected with partial life. Among these must we place, to speak in the mildest terms, such Rationalists as not altogether without their own fault tarry long in the outer court, who, as *halfthinkers* (like the Jews going not beyond their preparatory half-knowledge of the Old Testament), hold a personal God without Christ. In the case of some of them, those whose hearts are sincere, the mystical Christ may be unconsciously possessed as the long-suffering Angel of the Covenant; but in the case of those who persist to the uttermost in conscious opposition to the influence of Revelation, it comes at last to

[1] He who can *hate* God who is eternal love, absolutely knoweth Him not.

[2] "To take the Lord for our God is the natural part of the covenant; the supernatural part is, to take Christ for our Redeemer. The former is first necessary, and implied in the latter." Baxter's Saint's Rest, Fawcett's Abridgment, p. 81.

Hosted by Google

what is written—He that hath not the Son, hath not God![1] Repentance itself is first made perfect and confirmed in faith toward Christ; the full understanding of the monotheist foundation, בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא, comes to the *whole-thinker* first in ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος—which again the Spirit of the Son, who became flesh and was then glorified, brought to light out of the rubbish of inquiring philosophy.

Many, from the earliest times, not content with the simple accusative of the persons after the emphatic γινώσκωσι, have therefore sought to introduce some abstraction as the object of the knowledge. Hence even Luther's paraphrase—*That* Thou alone art the true God; although he is inconsistent with himself in the second clause, in which he does not similarly continue. A superficial exposition, however, has done so, and we find Freilinghausen and Francke correcting Luther with all confidence by adding—And Jesus *as* the Christ, that He is Christ. So, *e.g.*, Clericus, Wolle, Nösselt, Kuinoel, Meyer, and Lücke, formerly. Kling, on the contrary, observes very properly, "*according to the sense* this 'acknowledge *as*,' may be admitted (we would say rather, according to the primary sense); but *grammatically* it can be resolved only thus, To know Thee, who art the only true God, and Jesus *who is the Messiah*." (So also Lampe.) This, then, would interpret as if there were an εἶναι in the passage. But the meaning is by no means thus exhausted, and Tholuck says again, "Not to mention other reasons against it, the *article* ought not to be wanting to Χριστός, just as we find it in ch. xx. 31." J. M. Faber assumed such an εἶναι, but with another application in the second clause —*And Jesus Christ to be He whom Thou hast sent.* Stolz translates, "And as Thy Sent One." Lücke afterward adopted this, on the ground that Ἰησοῦς Χριστός together is in St John a proper name, the predicative term of dignity, Χριστός being not indeed altogether lost sight of, but sunk in the proper name. This view is the clearest to all the pseudo-friends of light—as we see in the case of Stolz himself—because they

[1] "In the soul of every unregenerate man *the creature is both God and Christ.* As turning from the creature to God, and not by Christ, is no true turning (that is, no whole turning)—so believing in Christ, while the creature hath our hearts, is no true believing." Baxter, as before.

Hosted by Google

would place in connection with the only true *God* no more than a *man* sent by Him.[1] But we shall presently see that all this does not penetrate to the kernel of this wonderful saying. It does, indeed, permit such preliminary acceptations to the weak and sincere, *because the Lord's wisdom and love does not lay down such stiff and rigid symbola as His Church too often does*, but to all truly sincere seekers it approves on deeper investigation the equal Godhead of the Son.

The equal Godhead of Him who was sent? And here too, where the God who sent Him is placed in conjunction with Him as the *only* true God? This is the taunting question of too many in our day, who triumphantly pervert this sacred word of the prayer of Jesus into their own Rationalist symbol. But let us look at it more closely! At the outset, it is by no means established, as these people suppose, that μόνος stands here as excluding and opposed to Him who was sent; it is, indeed, open to question whether this μόνος is to be construed into predicate or subject. Pater est *unus verus Deus*—*Pater solus* est verus Deus, are two propositions wide as the heavens asunder. Have we not already shown, by the significant antithesis to the heathenish and pantheist multiplication of gods and deification of all things, that the μόνος as strictly connected with ἀληθινός must be a *predicate?* Thus Clemens, ad Cor. Epist. i. understood it, when he wrote, with allusion to this passage, Thus He acted, in order to the glorification of the name of the true and only God. And so does the Peschito expressly translate, אנת אֱלָהָא דִשְׁרָרָא בִּלְחוֹדָךְ. The *sole, personal God*, as opposed to all the multiplicity of so-called אֱלֹהִים, as well as to all creaturely צְבָאוֹת of heaven and earth:—this is the fundamental truth of Scripture; and it is not abolished, but rather unfolded, by the doctrine of the Trinity, so that we no longer regard the μόνος as an abstract and dead unity. Comp. the μόνος, Rom. xvi. 27; 1 Tim. i. 17; and even Matt. xix. 17, εἷς—etc. It was simple infatuation, and nothing more, which led Crellius in the Tract. de uno Deo Patre, p. 2, to declare Jno. xvii. 3 to be *the first testimony and argument of his opinion.* But how are we to

[1] Lücke, however, does not make common cause with them, since he adds the caution, "But both predicate and subject are embraced as the one object of the γινώσκειν."

Hosted by Google

understand the words, so as to retain in them the doctrine of the equal Divinity of Jesus Christ, as it is contained in the whole of Scripture, and in this entire prayer?

Many of the Fathers, as Augustine,[1] Ambrose, and Hilary, referred the predicate τὸν μόνον κ.τ.λ. to both the Persons named, and assumed Jesus Christ to be included therein, connecting the καί and the σέ closely together. Not otherwise Chrys. and Euthymius, who expressly supplement an εἶναι, to which the καί would likewise belong. This was well-meaning and conformable to the truth; but it scarcely needs to be shown that it was an enforced and untenable exegesis, as Lampe clearly perceived. Nevertheless, Christ is by no means excluded here from the Godhead, but is positively united in one with the Father. The grounds of this assertion are these:—

First: The counter-proof from the apparent meaning of the words, even if the μόνος excludes only false Gods, avails not as an *argumentum a silentio*, since Christ here speaks *primarily* of His human person and nature. It runs—Whom Thou hast sent; not—Whom Thou hast *begotten!* And very appropriately so: for this latter mystery is not to be *known* in the sense in which the word here holds; nor does eternal life depend (as the Athanasian Creed too boldly says) upon our accepting the Trinitarian mysteries, with or without understanding. Rapp and all his brother Rationalists are right in this. Christ does actually *pray* here, consequently not as God to Himself. Lampe: Nunquam magis fas erat, ut Pater, contra distincte ad Filium, in hac σχέσει Filio obversaretur, quam in præsenti occasione, cum coram throno Patris in humili illâ formâ tanquam servus obediens adstaret—cumque ita etiam impleret prophetarum oracula, qui eum precando Patrem pro *Deo suo* agnoscentem introduxerant. Berlenb. Bibel: "Two main points are the keys to this whole prayer. 1. That Christ presents Himself in His official character before the Father in the deepest humiliation, yet as a Person intimately near to the Father. 2. That the economy of the Father and that of the Son are exhibited in their perfect harmony." Yes verily, in

[1] De Spirit. et litera, cap. 22, where he speaks of vivere de Deo, apud quem est fons vitæ, and cites this passage thus: *id est*, te et quem misisti Jesum Christum [cognoscant] unum verum Deum.

Hosted by Google

the humiliation of one who prays He is yet a Person intimately near; so near, that the prayer passes in the *Thou* and in the *We* into the colloquy of an equal—as we shall see. Is not this of itself enough?

But secondly: How *could* the Son as a creature be the glorifier of the Father, the Mediator and Giver of life to all flesh; how *could* He as such *place Himself by the side of* the Father by a strictly parallel accusative? Luther says forcibly and truly, "He mixes and blends Himself in the same sole Divine essence, authority, and power; for He will be acknowledged equally with the Father as the giver of eternal life." It is the same juxtaposition as in ch. xiv. 1; concerning which—blasphemous for every creature, but appropriate to the Son—we have already spoken enough on that passage. The babblers who find here *no more than* a praying mortal, have but a very slight perception of what the prerogative of God's honour *above* every praying creature demands. Was not Moses *sent* of God, and many others like him? But how would it run, Eternal life and blessedness consists in this, to know God and Moses—or God *and Paul!* But He who prays here thus absolutely speaks *Himself* to God—To know *Thee and Me!* As neither the Archangel Gabriel nor Michael could present himself before the throne of his Creator with the words which precede and which follow these—Glorify me, that I may glorify Thee! I have glorified Thee, *and now* glorify Thou me!—no more could he presume upon such a juxtaposition as is found here in ver. 3.

Thirdly: We now cannot but see that that preliminary acceptation—To know *Thee* as God, Me *as* Christ or *as* sent of Thee—does not by any means satisfy the meaning of the words. For eternal life cannot be regarded as flowing from the knowledge of the office and work of a man, cannot consist immediately in that *just as* it does in the knowledge of the living God. Therefore, in the second clause also, the γινώσκειν is certainly spoken of the *Person*, not of His teaching or work. Luther here misses the point, "Hence the force lies in the little word *Thee*, that they may know Thee. Whom? Thee, who hast sent Jesus Christ!" For, it is not σὲ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με—but, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας. This Person sent, however, is the same

Hosted by Google

who in ch. x. 30 said ἕν ἐσμεν. Thus the inmost and true object of the knowledge transcends the predicates Christ and Sent, and can be found only in the subject of these predicates, One with the only God. According to 1 John v. 20, where οὗτος incontrovertibly refers to the Son, Jesus Christ, He also is the true God and eternal life. Does this then render necessary two ἀληθινοὶ θεοί, or does not the μόνος retain notwithstanding its propriety? In St Jude's Epistle, ver. 4, Christ is termed ὁ μόνος δεσπότης καὶ κύριος—in ver. 25 we have again μόνῳ θεῷ. Does not all this consist well together, on the presupposition of the Trinitarian unity? As in that most simple Apostles' Creed *before* the Apostles' Creed, 1 Cor. viii. 6, we may ask—Is therefore the Father not also *Lord?* So here—Is therefore the Son not also *God?*[1]

Fourthly, and finally: We have only to connect this verse, instead of wresting it as an isolated saying, I say not with the entire Scripture, nor with the whole of this Gospel from its prologue downward, but with the whole of the prayer in which it is found, in order to be constrained to admit the full force of its testimony! Does the Lord here pray only as one sent unto men, like other men, with an office and work to fulfil? At the outset, in ver. 1, the eternal *Son* comes into the presence of the Father boldly and as an equal—in ver. 5 He speaks of His eternal existence with God, before the world was—consequently, ἐξῆλθον in ver. 8 is the profounder interpretation of the ἀπέστειλας—then see ver. 10—and still rising higher, ἡμεῖς, ver. 11, ἡμῖν ver. 21—in ver. 22, ἡμεῖς ἕν ἐσμεν—and all in this one prayer, uttered before His death! There is but one interpretation of ver. 3 which harmonises with all this, and it is that which we have given. Olshausen had no right to say that "this verse cannot be used *as a proof-passage* (for the Divinity of Christ)," especially as he afterward in part corrects himself, and speaks more to the point. It is a proof-passage, and that not merely *consequentially*, as it is said, but by the force of the most rigid exegesis. Lücke, too, speaks inexactly, "The passage is neither Trinitarian nor anti-Trini-

[1] Quod si unus Deus pater Christo non adimit ut unus sit Dominus, ita solus Deus Pater verus Christo Jesu non aufert, ut verus Deus sit. Hilar. de Trin. lib. ix.

Hosted by Google

tarian, because its standing-point is not the idea of the Logos, but the historical manifestation of Jesus Christ." This last is partly true; but the passage is made only the more convincingly Trinitarian by the fact that this Jesus Christ does nevertheless in this way "mix and blend His own being with that sole eternal Godhead."

We have left to the last a tremendous difficulty which some have found for themselves; a difficulty which many of our readers, both simple and thoughtful, would hardly be able to discover or even believe unless it were told them. The Lord, in His Father's presence and speaking of Himself, mentions His two names, that of His person and of His office—*Jesus Christ!* These people, and we do not envy or disturb them, find in this incontrovertible evidence that the whole is nothing more than a composition of the Evangelist John. Even Lücke, however, who scarcely more than *tolerated* the third person in the solemn style of prayer, as it has occurred previously, now joins these opponents in regarding the Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν as "*intolerable.*" He does not scruple even to approve Bretschneider's *lapsus est auctor*, cum e suo ingenio scriberet! With all respect for the learned Doctor, not Bretschneider but Lücke, we cannot refrain from uttering our testimony that such an expression as this, and the critical assumption of judgment upon the Apostle and the Evangelist John from which it springs, is itself, to say the least, *intolerable.* What possible notion, in God's name, of the relation of the Evangelist to the Holy Spirit, and of His assistance in the preservation of *this prayer* for the Church, must the man have who can reconcile with it such a *lapsus* as would scarcely befall the most insignificant author, or to whom such a *lapsus* would in itself be *endurable?* Did not the blessed Evangelist take sufficient pains in revising his manuscript, and thus suffer to go forth uncorrected to the world such an "offence against historical propriety" (as de Wette calls it)?—The matter is simple enough, if we would take the pains to investigate and pause before we pronounce our absolute decisions. True it is that this Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν in the lips of Jesus Himself is striking, indeed it stands here alone in its kind; but it is on that account all the more impressive, and appropriately in its place. After the Lord in vers. 1, 2 (before He comes to

Hosted by Google

the *Ἐγώ* of ver. 4) had already most solemnly, *with as much lowliness as dignity*, spoken of Himself, the Son, in the third person, this *self-objectivising*—the lower analogies of which we have in so many psalm-prayers of the servant, as of the king—*progresses* in ver. 3 into a perfect self-designation, because here the *γινώσκειν* is to have its object exhibited in the Person of Him who is elevated to equality with God, and as such is to be from this time presented to the world, even as He now presents Himself as such to the Father. With him who does not *feel* this, we have no contention. This "Jesus Christ" is said to have been derived, as an expression of John himself, from his prologue, ch. i. 17;—but why may we not reverse the proposition, since the disciples must learn first of the Master, how to speak of Him?

This is, indeed, the only time that the Lord Himself unites thus simply and immediately His Christ-name with His Jesus-name;—but the occasion stands alone. He presents Himself, in the presence of His listening disciples, before the Father in the most sublime self-testimony; uttering that designation of Himself which was *thereby* sanctified, instituted, and ordained for all future testimony to His person. And we may say that the apostolical custom of using *Jesus Christ* as one double appellative, making *Χριστός* also a proper name, had its origin in this word of our Lord. Speak of Him as He spoke of Himself before God—this was the Spirit's suggestion to their minds. The Lord here confirms, unfolds, explains, and glorifies the central word of the Old Testament, now fulfilled in Him; avows in the most solemn manner before the Father that He, Jesus, this Son of man and Son of God, sent and proceeding from the Father, and who now advances to His death, is the *μόνος ἀληθινὸς Χριστός*—the *only true Messiah;* but He thereby also *protests against* and annihilates *every false notion of the Messiah*, as in the former clause *every false God*. Still more: He reveals and sets His conclusive seal to what was scarcely recognised at all in Israel—that *Χριστός* and *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* really *coincide and are synonymous*. Is not this of itself enough to justify the use of this language as most appropriate? In the *ἀπέστειλας* is thus latent the *ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τοῦ πατρός*, in the *Χριστός* we now see that *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* is included—for, to

Hosted by Google

repeat the question, how otherwise could the knowledge of this Christ, alike with the knowledge of God, be eternal life? Let it now be observed that, in 1 Jno. v. 1, for example, it is merely said, *whoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ;* but this immediately afterwards in ver. 5 alternates with *He that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God.* And a locus classicus like this of the highest dignity, which establishes and teaches us how to understand the formula of the whole New Testament, is to be explained as a marvellous *lapsus auctoris*, a reduction into its original source of a formula which existed without any such high and solemn reason! Finally, if it is the personal name *Jesus* which is the really "intolerable" thing, as being uttered by Jesus Himself, we have only to remark that all which had preceded gives ample justification of its use, as inseparably belonging to that formula of testimony to His own person in which the Lord here prototypically presents Himself before the Father and the world. For the rest, we would quote Lampe once more, whose words must have their full weight: "Not to no purpose is it that the Lord does not simply say *Me*, but speaks of Himself in the third person; commemorating Himself *His own proper name*, in order that He may intimate the *mystical meaning which it involves*." Or is it a fortuitous and meaningless thing that the Son of Mary was called *Jesus?* This *name of salvation* (Lu. ii. 21), first uttered by Gabriel, which combines a *name* common among the people with the sole and incomparable truth of its *signification*, which was borne in the Old Testament by typical persons, which in apostolical preaching is expounded even as the angel of the Lord had expounded it (Acts iv. 12, v. 31; Matt. i. 21)—is it not here, if anywhere, fittingly used, where He who bears it presents Himself before the Father *in the full consciousness* of its power and meaning?[1]

Vers. 4, 5. To have the authority and power to save, according to the meaning of His name,[2] to give eternal life in the

[1] And was it not something affectingly belonging to the *joy of His departure*, that the Spirit should impress upon Him in all its clearness and blessedness the encouraging truth—Thou art called *Jesus*, for Thou shalt save Thy people from their sins! Thus St Matthew's record of the *conception*, and St John's of the *departure*, coincide in *the name of Jesus*.

[2] Ecclus. xlvi. 1, ὃς ἐγένετο κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μέγας ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ ἐκ-

Hosted by Google

living knowledge of Himself and through Him of the Father—this is the joy and the crown of His *Jesus-heart* at the present point of transition in His prayer, as He approaches the Father with the *name of Jesus*, that this name also may be *glorified* with and in Him. But eternal life is the fruit and consequence of His glorification, which rests upon the fulfilment of His redeeming *mediatorial work*:—He therefore proceeds to speak of this, developing and establishing it more fully. They are greatly in error, although there are many orthodox men among them, who would understand by the work merely the *teaching office* of Jesus. Albertini, *e.g.*, says incorrectly in his sermon, "To have happily finished His office of teaching was to Him a great thing—but He presently thinks of the mighty *arrears* of His work, and prays that the Father would glorify Him again through the suffering of death." We saw so far back as ch. iv. that the great seedtime and harvest were anticipated and united proleptically in one—and can we suppose Him *here* to have spoken less comprehensively? He expressly describes the work *upon earth*, as if He was already lifted up from the earth, and looking back upon it from heaven; the spirit of prayer so elevates Him that He can say in ver. 11—I am no more in the world! Ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is indeed the antithesis to παρὰ σεαυτῷ, παρὰ σοί, that is, in Thy heaven. (Bengel: terra defecerat a Deo.) Had He not already suffered upon earth, and were not the sufferings of death the final consummation of His human life in humility? Thus the ἐτελείωσα (τελειώσας is an unworthy substitution) is an anticipation, like the *I have overcome* of ch. xvi. 33, which gives its predominant tone to the entire prayer. In this *finished*, before the fulfilment upon the cross,[1] consists the pre-eminent wonder of this prayer, which anticipates the heavenly mediation and intercession. The great *Remain-*

λεκτῶν αὐτοῦ. Let not the Apocrypha be too much despised; it contains many preludes and echoes of the Spirit of prophecy, and some remarkably seeming to go beyond the limits of the canonical writings. Throughout the praises of the Fathers in Ecclesiasticus, it is in the case of Abraham and Solomon alone that the signification of the name is lightly touched—Why is it then that in the case of Joshua it is made so strikingly prominent? The Bible closes, Rev. xxii. 16-20, with the single name Jesus; ver. 21 being all that is added.

[1] See the Apostle's fainter echo in 2 Tim. iv. 6-8.

Hosted by Google

der, of which Albertini speaks, is not the suffering of death as such, for that also is merged in the victory of eternal life, but the glorification with the Father Himself in heaven, as it is here simply expressed. And even that is not so much in reserve, as now assigned and already His own, even while He befittingly prays for it; for in ver. 10 we find a δεδόξασμαι, in vers. 22, 24 the δόξα which was already given to Him. We observed before that there is not even a *thanksgiving* at the end of the finished prayer, and that is true; for the avowal and testimony before God—Thou gavest Me the power, Thou gavest Me all to whom I give eternal life; and now again—*Thou gavest* Me the work to do! is something different from and more than thanksgiving in the sense of the children of men. But previous to this honour assigned to the Father, comes the equally valid honour and dignity of the Son—*I have finished the work*, and thereby *glorified Thy name, and now glorify Me!* Once more, who might thus speak before the throne of the μεγαλοπρεπὴς δόξα (2 Pet. i. 17)—except the eternal Son, well-pleasing to the Father, and well-beloved of Him in His humanity? More is expressed in this καὶ νῦν—indicating in itself the hour which had come (Euthymius)—than merely, "the interchange of love," as Olshausen thinks, needlessly seeking to do away with any idea of compensating reward. We dare not say that the praying Son regarded that as only a reciprocation of love which in the presence of the holy and righteous Father was really the crown set upon His worthiness. Heb. ii. 9; Phil. ii. 9. But even the Son is in this ἐδόξασα and ἐτελείωσα perfectly conscious of His own worthiness and merit.[1]—"He founds this petition upon His obedience," as Braune says, and as Theophylact, in this better than Euthymius, expounds it in almost the same words. We must receive this as the most sacred earnestness of scriptural teaching, and take it as our own strong consolation; not sentimentally robbing it of all its meaning, as for instance Herder irreverently does, to the scandal of the devout, when he writes concerning this prayer, "That which Christ regarded as the most precious booty of His short earthly life, for which he thanked God as

[1] See what has been already said, upon ch. xiii. 32.

Hosted by Google

His richest gain, is His wreath and recompence in that world, an unfading heavenly flower of friendship!!" Here, if anywhere, is such aesthetic sentimentality loathsome and out of place.

It is necessary to observe carefully that the object of this *glorify*—*μέ*—as it comes into close connection with the *σὺ πάτερ*, is by no means merely the *humanity*,[1] any more than it is the eternal Godhead of the Son in itself; but the entire Person of the God-man as one. If He referred to Himself simply as man, how could He say that He already *had* this glory before the world was? If He referred simply to Himself as the Son of God, what would be the giving again of a glory which had never been essentially laid aside or given up? To deduce from these words, with Thomasius and others, the doctrine that even the Divine nature was the subject of *exinanitio*, is—whatever value such speculations may have in their place—to travel beyond the simple meaning of our text, which knows nothing of any such separation and distinction in the consciousness of Jesus. The *glorifying* which He here arrogates is to be understood only as the correlative of the *κρύψις* and *κένωσις* involved in the taking flesh, and which had now come to an end in this *νῦν*. In the *glorify Me* the humanity remains entire, yea, in the integrity even of flesh and blood, as we saw in ch. vi.; it is not such a return to the Father, such an assumption again by the Father, as would involve the forsaking His flesh as well as the world. For He prays, or rather desires, Take now this humanity, in which I have accomplished the work, also into heaven with Thee—thither, where My Divinity hath been from all eternity. The two natures and persons of the *ἐγὼ ἐτελείωσα* and the *εἶχον* are inseparably united in *δόξασόν με*. Christ prayed that id, quod tum filius hominis est, ad perfectum Dei filium, *i.e.* ad resumendam indulgendamque *corpori* æternitatis suæ gloriam, per resurrectionis (et ascensionis!) potentiam gigneretur; quam gloriam a Patre corporeus reposcebat. Non nova quærit, *non aliena desiderat;* esse talis qualis fuerat, postulat, sed precatur: id se, quod antea erat, esse, gigni scilicet ad id, quod suum fuit.[2] It

[1] As most of the fathers have carelessly said, such as Hilary, Chrys., Theodor. Heracl., and Mopsu., Augustine, Theophylact, Euthymius.

[2] Hilar. Tract. in Ps. ii. c. 27. See in Dorner, Entwickelungsgeschichte, S. 1063.

Hosted by Google

is as if in this παρὰ σεαυτῷ He had approached the Father with the language of the Psalm—Set Me at Thy right hand! "The *incarnate* Son now takes His part in glory, returns in a glorified human form to God; the Son of God and the Son of man are for ever united in Jesus, as the almighty and yet human Ruler of the universe. It is the same pure *I* which had been from all eternity in glory with God, and which *became in time cognisable in Jesus;* this I, this personality, was once only in the Son of God, but since the ascension it has existed in Divine majesty in the God-man." (Fikenscher.)

It may be hoped that this will help us to understand the εἶχον concerning which Bengel says—hic non dicit *accepi*, "He does not say, *which I received.*" The Socinians of old and recently cease not to refer this to the Divine counsel and predetermination;[1] B.-Crus., after Wetstein, Nösselt, Gabler, etc., reasserts the old *destinatum habere*, as involved either in the ἔχειν, or even (as Eckermann will have it!) in the παρὰ σοί—in Thy counsel and mind! To that humble and believing spirit which instinctively recoils from all wresting of Scripture, it is an offence even to refute such interpretations. It may be thought that even Augustine bordered upon it[2]—but in *his* case it is only in appearance; he does no more than needlessly discriminate between the Lord's Divinity and humanity. Indeed, he is so far right as the eternal ἔχειν of the Divine nature must be regarded as having *prædestinando* extended itself also to the human.

Παρὰ σοί, finally, belongs per synchysin to the εἶχον, as the Syr. translates, הֲוָא לִי לְוָתָךְ מִן קֳדָם דְּנֶהְוֶא עָלְמָא. The intermediate clause—before the world was—is by no means an accommodated expression, describing an extra-temporal eternity in a popular manner and according to human notions,—as some are contented with thinking, who do not perceive the massive weight of all

[1] Grotius: habebam—destinatione tua! *Sic* legem ante mundum aiunt fuisse Hebræi! But even Episcopius, as Tholuck quotes him, saw that then—Christ would have said nothing more of Himself than what any man might say.

[2] Intelligamus prædestinationem claritatis humanæ, quæ in illo est, naturæ, ex mortali immortalis apud Patrem futuræ, et hoc jam prædestinando factum fuisse antequam mundus esset, quod in mundo etiam suo tempore fieret. Tract. cv. 7.

Hosted by Google

such words as these.[1] Creation in time is by no means of itself a mere human notion, but the Lord here confirms this first-dogma of Scripture by the clearest utterance of His own consciousness. In *πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον* (that is, here, *τὴν κτίσιν*) *εἶναι* everything creaturely is excluded, and upon this foundation is then built the most emphatic *παρὰ σοί*—With Thee in eternity before the beginning of the world and of time. Bengel: quia tum extra Deum nil erat. Even Hippolytus, constrained by this word, was obliged to say, "For He was ever in the excellent glory, coexisting with the Father of whom He was begotten before the ages, before time, and before the foundation of the world." If there was nothing then *extra Deum*, the Son was *θεός*, but at the same time, however, as Son *πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, *in the bosom* of the Father. This hypostatical distinction in the unity of nature is expressed here also in the *παρά*. Thus it is not as the heretic Marcellus of Ancyra thought, "*Nothing else was beside God alone*, and the *Λόγος* before the creation of the world lay in the Father only *δυνάμει*, as *ἐνέργεια δραστικὴ πράξεως*, thus being simply one with Him, as being no other than a possibility in Himself." For the Lord says *παρὰ σοί* with reference to the *σὺ πάτερ*; He therefore carries back the name *Son*, which the incarnation had made prominent, even to His eternal pre-existence before the world was:—He thus permits and obliges us to recognize the mystery of an eternal Sonship in Him who was begotten before all worlds.

This *πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι* (comp. Ps. xc. 2) corresponds with the *ἀρχή* *before* the *πάντα ἐγένετο*. Here, not simply as the Vulg. translates, priusquam mundus *fieret*, but priusquam *esset*. In ver. 24 afterwards we find instead *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, a well-known and frequently occurring phrase, see Matt. xiii. 35, xxv. 34; Lu. xi. 50; Eph. i. 4; 1 Pet. i. 20; Heb. iv. 3. If only on this account no one should undertake to say that *κόσμος* here in ver. 5 is only the world of earth and men, as in ver. 6 and subsequently.[2] But there is here the same transition

[1] Hiller: As a child is taught that the little brook which it looks into is derived from the ocean, and returns to it.

[2] Schmieder reckons the word "world" nineteen times in the prayer, this being the first; but he forgets to remark that this *first time* it has a peculiar signification, which does not recur till ver. 24.

Hosted by Google

from the general to the particular as in the Prologue from *all things were made by Him* to *the world was made by Him.* In Heb. i. 2 and xi. 3 we find τοὺς αἰῶνας. Καταβάλλεσθαι means to lay the foundation; to fix, establish, begin, with and without θεμέλιον. (Heb. vi. 1.) Καταβολή is the foundation or establishment in being, which meaning is to be preferred even in Heb. xi. 11 to that other—see Gen. iv. 25 (Sept.). Compare Job xxxviii. 4; Ps. xxiv. 2, etc.[1] And now let every one submit to hear this most plain and irresistible expression of the *self-consciousness of Christ in the presence of His Father* (not merely "the Apostle's self-consciousness"), in which He testifies in prayer His own pre- and extra-temporal existence with the Father before all εἶναι of any κόσμος, any κτίσις.[2] This Divine εἶναι πρό may, for the rest, be termed (with Ebrard) "an eternal, dynamic *Prius* in relation to the creation of the temporal universe"—this all the more firmly establishes it that this *creation* of time and the world is the *beginning* of that time. Men may deal with all other passages of Scripture which teach a creation in time as if they consisted of mere human representations, and dogmatical forms of teaching, beneath which deeper principles lie, for the research of speculation—though not one of them is so handled without injustice; but here we would appeal to the inextinguishable feeling of truth in the mind of every speculatist, and ask if in the consciousness of Christ this πρό did not express a real and literal truth.

Certain it is that to *distinguish* the *eternal* Son from the *temporal world* created through Him, the πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως from the κτίσις (of which a false exposition of this word would make him part!)—to *apprehend* how He is ἄχρονος and yet not ἄναρχος (this heretical expression being *rightly* interpreted)—is a goal of our knowledge which is unattainable in this state. All speculation which has striven to attain satisfaction upon this point, in the present state, and by its own thinking, has resulted in confusion, confounding for the most part the Son

[1] Thus the mystico-theosophical interpretation of καταβολή as connected with the Fall of the angels, which Feldhoff's Paragraphen zur Geschichte suggest is altogether contrary to the meaning of the word.

[2] And that, if we add ver. 24, as the eternal object of His *love.* Compare the remarks upon this most weighty saying in Liebner's Christologie i. 155.

Hosted by Google

and the universe. The בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא, as the first and last word of Scripture, is embraced and held fast only by *faith*. In Heb. xi. 3, it is *πίστει νοοῦμεν*, not *γνώσει ἐπιγινώσκομεν*. Rothe's theological speculation—and this is the most recent example—has not steered clear of the error of heathenish and natural thinking, which knows of nothing but an eternal world which must be blended in its Ὄν with God; and into this error must *all* speculation run which does not content itself with the *γνῶσις ἐν πίστει*.[1] For ourselves, we would accept the challenge which he throws out, and test the results of such speculation by the canon of *Scripture*. We ask, can there be any such thing as a canonical Scripture, if "the difference between the popular presentation of the matter which prevails in the Bible, and the more rigorously scientific ideas which speculative theology demands," is to be accepted in such a sense as to make the word of God reveal a beginning, when there could have been none, and the Son of God speak of a "*before* the world," when any such *before* is inconceivable and impossible. We ask whether the consciousness of Jesus, uttering itself in this Highpriestly Prayer in expressions so definite and plain, is to be represented as merely a concession to the habit of uncultivated thought which requires a "temporal priority of God before the world," in order to the maintenance of His "priority as the First Cause." *To us* the answer is obvious. We would not in our thoughts and words go beyond or differ from the thoughts and words of Christ Himself; we would think, as the Spirit of God has taught multitudes of thinkers both before Christ and since, both of an actual creation and an actual Creator. We maintain that the Son of God in humanity declares here a beginning of the world; and this one word—*before the world was*—yea, the little word

[1] His process of creation is simply the process by which God the Spirit becomes the world; a process, too, which has no completion or limit. He boldly maintains that "*the notion of a creation in time is altogether untenable*, nor should we shrink any longer from admitting the eternity and imperishableness of creation." He maintains that creating and being a Creator essentially lie in the idea of God; that the transition from not creating to creating would inevitably involve a change in God. "In the beginning—the first moment of time"—in relation to Him (notwithstanding Gen. i. 1; Jno. i. 1), is not conceivable! And matter as pure matter is like God without beginning, etc. See his Ethik i. S. 98 ff.

Hosted by Google

before itself, condemns all speculation which denies it;—all speculation, that is, which takes a ground independent of scriptural revelation, and would evolve its so-called idea of God out of its own creaturely consciousness of the εἶναι, or "absolute pure being." The everlasting distinction between the eternal Creator and the temporal creature, as it is established by the *revealed* word concerning the *only true God*, is irremovably fixed to the *consciousness of faith*; and the philosophers should learn a lesson from the fact that they can never make their notions intelligible to those who cherish a simple and living faith.

This may be enough upon the little word *before*. But now we must regard the verse under another point of view, and say something in refutation of a certain doctrine which imagines the Son of God, existing before His incarnation, to have become an angel from the beginning of the creation.[1] This hypothesis assumes that what is here, Jno. xvii. 5 (and elsewhere) said *cannot be referred* to the inalienable glory of the uncreated *Logos*. But we do not see why it cannot, provided we seize the twofold relation in the δόξασόν με and the εἶχον in its unity:—to have a proper view of this is necessary for the right understanding of all the attributes of the Divine and human person of Christ. Why might not the God-man as man, consequently also *as God-man*, be again glorified with the glory which He, the same God-man, that is, the same *I before the world was* which has *now* entered into humanity, *had* already as the eternal Son? If the assumption of the nature of the first-created angel were in the background of these words, the πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι would not retain its literal truth (since this πρωτότοκος, ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως, Rev. iii. 14, so understood, belongs also to the κόσμος), nor would the εἶχον in its absolute contrast hold good, the sense of an *accepi* being then necessarily substituted. If *in the world*, Jno. i. 10, is declared to mean, As a part of the world, as a creature; and *in the form*, Phil. ii. 6, is expounded as best befitting

[1] Brought forward anew in Dr Barth's remarkable Sendscreiben an Schelling: Der Engel des Bundes. Leipzig 1845. And it is hinted at in Brandt's Schullehrerbibel, which observes upon Jno. xvii. 5, "This cannot refer to His Divinity, of which He could not be emptied, and with which He could not be glorified, but only to the glory which He had as the Angel of the Covenant before all other creatures were."

Hosted by Google

the idea of a created being—it is by an exegesis which we regard as both perilous and needless. If it is said that the *Angel of the Lord* in the Old Testament, whose identity with Christ is confessed, cannot be deemed to be an "uncreated angel" without a contradiction, we need only remember that מַלְאָךְ (used, as is well known, also of men) is generally *one sent* or a *messenger*, and that therefore there is no contradiction in His *going forth* or *being sent*, who is, nevertheless, in His nature the Word and Revealer of the hidden God. Barth himself admits that "the assumption of the Logos becoming an angel before His incarnation does not remove the difficulty, but rather increases it." Regard it as we may, it only throws it further back. We find the solution of all these difficulties—riddles and problems much harder than any which the simply-understood word of Scripture presents to us—in the acceptation of that idea of the *Living Three-One* God, which alone is conformable with Scripture. It acknowledges in the living God Himself, in consistency with His infinity, which is not a mere dead abstraction, the *principle* of all distinction and formation, that is, the *original ground*, the true ἀρχή of all κτίσις, and thus finds no difficulty in accepting the μορφὴ θεοῦ as before the creation of the world. Finally, Heb. ii. 16 may be regarded as decisive against any union of the Son with the nature of angels; not, indeed, according to the direct meaning of the *took not upon Him*, as Luther's translation assumes—but in the connection of the whole Epistle, in itself, and with the whole scriptural system, in which no trace of any such relation of *the angels* to the Son is found, even when they are professedly the subject of discourse.

Instead of all those vain and adventurous incursions into things too high for us, let us adoringly enter into the eternal counsel of *our salvation*, which was already, before the foundation of the world, purposed in the Son, whose glorification even as the Son of man was eternally contemplated by Him as predestined. This is the *practical* bearing of the inexhaustible saying which we now consider. We may quote Hermann's hymn: "The foundation of the world was not laid, heaven was not yet created, when God planned for my best interest; His grace was extended to me before I had my being. It was His counsel that I should have life through His only begotten Son; Him

Hosted by Google

would He provide as a Mediator for me, Him did He set forth as a propitiatory, that through His blood I should be sanctified and saved." Or the words of Hofacker's simple and fervent sermon on Jno. xvii.: "Satan was not yet created, nor had he fallen; Adam was not yet created, nor had he fallen; no sinner walked upon the earth, the earth itself was not yet, nor was there any sin, for there existed no creature which could sin; death was not yet, for there was none to die;—when in the eternal depths of the Godhead the *plan of redemption* was projected, the method appointed by which sin should be abolished, and death slain, by which *the Son* should bruise the serpent's head, and obtain for Himself power over all flesh, that He might give eternal life to all who should be given Him of the Father." We think, for ourselves, that it better becomes the creature, and is more in harmony with our inmost consciousness of God, is most safe to the mind, and blessed to the heart, adoringly to contemplate (Matt. xxv. 34; Eph. i. 4, 5; Jno. xvii. 24) the eternal counsel of the Creator's love in human redemption—than, with Rothe, to speculate about the continuation of the creating work in a moral process, the elevation and the transformation of the ὕλη into πνεῦμα—in theories which regard evil as necessarily and unavoidably growing out of blind matter, yet yielding by slow degrees to the necessary process of the development of God in the world; and which, finally, instead of that consummation in the σαββατισμός which the Scripture holds out, and man's heart yearns for (the pit of eternal fire, however, which glorifies the justice of God being beneath), shadows out an eternal succession of processes such as he endeavours to explain.

The prayer at its outset concerned *His own person*, as all true prayer under human relations must, when it proceeds from urgent internal impulse. But what a difference between this "*Glorify* Me!" and every "Help me! Give me!" of other children of men! In a sole and unapproachable sense the incarnate Son of God, the Saviour of all flesh, can and must first and last speak only concerning Himself in the Father's presence. The "Help Me!" can find no expression here. Instead of "Give Me!" we hear His witness, as not *before*, but already *upon* the throne, speaking in majesty on the right hand of

Hosted by Google

majesty, "Thou hast given to Me—that I may give!" and now, at the highest point of this elevation, we hear the perfect expression of that *objectivity* which, as it were, softens whatever might seem discordant in *such* a style of praying from human lips, by an inexpressible tone of lowliness mingled with dignity: —"to know Thee and *Jesus Christ* is eternal life!" Upon this follows the first *I*, which makes the Son of man who had finished the work upon earth the same in person and consciousness with Him who was with the Father before the foundation of the world. Could it be otherwise than that this prayer, so beginning, should at its conclusion *lead all back again into His own person?* The foundation was laid in the high words, Father—Thou and I—I with Thee from eternity—*We are one!* And the end of His intercession for His own can be no other than—*I in them!*

In the second and middle section of the whole (vers. 6–19) we see that this "*I in them*" is the presupposed latent foundation of all; but its *final expression* is prepared for by an exposition of the whole way and process which leads to the truth and reality of this end:—set forth in words which are most sublime, and clear, and tranquil, and comprehensible, even to the childish capacity. We find that this section falls naturally into two parts. In vers. 6–13 the *fundamental reason* is brought out, on which rests the *I pray for them*, and out of which is developed the proper *petition* for their *preservation and defence*, the concentration of all intercession. Then follows, vers. 14–19, the *process* of this prayer itself, which leads back into the principle and origin of all again—I *for* them!

From the accomplished work of the glorification of the Father upon earth, the Lord descends first to the specific *prophetic* office which was really fulfilled in this *now;* and to this is then added, the beginning of the one being the end of the other, the *Highpriestly* office, which is, as it were, introduced in ver. 19. We must maintain, against Luthardt, that the "manifestation of the name" is not entirely the same as the glorification of the Father; although they may be made, by a pregnant interpretation, equivalent one to the other. For *here* vers. 6–8 speak especially of the preparation of an intelligent, acknowledging faith in the reception of the word; and then

Hosted by Google

first ver. 17, etc., of their sanctification as it is to be consummated, and which had been already contemplated in the great *anticipation* of ver. 4. I have revealed Thy name to them, given them Thy word in the words which Thou hast given Me —and *they* have received it and kept it in acknowledging faith. This is the foundation for the fellowship between the Lord and His own, on the ground of which alone they are worthy and capable of partaking His *special* intercession (in contrast with the world). *Thus He presents them to the Father* with their present faith in Him, and that is the *first* point. Vers. 6–8.[1] Hence *He prays for them*, that is, now and here, otherwise than for the world: this, approaching still nearer to the prayer itself, is the *second*. Vers. 9, 10.[2] Finally, the *third* is the direct utterance of the prayer for their *conservation* and *defence*. Vers. 11–13. All this prepared for the recognition of their *need*, despite the beginnings of grace—They are yet *in the world!*

The *detail of the intercession* itself, prepared for by the laying of this foundation, commences as before—I have given them Thy word; and then goes on to *pray*, first for their *preservation*, because, though no longer of the world, they are yet in the world, in the πονηρόν. Vers. 14–16. And then, since the root of this *evil* is the *sin* which still adheres to them, it is manifest, secondly, that this preservation to the end is not otherwise possible than through their *sanctification*:—that it is not in their case the keeping or guarding of something already perfect in them, but a τηρεῖν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, a ἁγιάζειν. Vers. 17, 18.[3] Thirdly, and finally, this sanctification of His own is *carried back* to the original principle and ground of all, His redeeming and atoning work.

Ver. 6. From the reassumed glory with the Father He looks

[1] Argumentum (but not tertium, primum rather, according to our arrangement) petitum est a *qualitate personarum*, pro quibus Jesus intercedebat, in quibus *initia gratiæ* conspiciebantur, quæ *conservari* fas erat. Lampe.

[2] Not merely with Olshausen: "The positive side of the prayer is now followed by the negative."

[3] Which is a preliminary reason for not understanding *the evil* as masculine, and the *sanctifying* as a mere *consecration*.

Hosted by Google

back and looks down upon His children in this fallen world of mankind, and presents them *with Himself* to the Father. We might say, with Olshausen, "in evidence, as it were, that the work was finished"—but this only connects it with what precedes: on the other hand, what precedes had been spoken only to pave the way for what now comes, this presentation and intercession. In thus coming to the Father, the Lord brings with Him His own, who are still notwithstanding in the world and amid its evil:—it is this which is the inmost meaning and reason of His intercession. A. H. Franke finds here the first evidence of a truth, to which he afterwards frequently reverts, that not only all the Lord's then existing disciples were included with the eleven, but that all His future followers and ourselves might appropriate His words—excluding, of course, those specific references which (as in ver. 18) point to the Apostles alone. But our exposition of the three preceding chapters has already clearly established the representative character of the first disciples to whom the Lord then spoke.

As to the developing connection between ver. 6 and ver. 5, we may say generally, with Luther, "To glorify the Father means to manifest His name; thus He had so proclaimed that name, as to prove to their hearts that he was a gracious *Father*, etc." It is presently made clear, vers. 11, 12, that a living knowledge of the Father's name is intended, and in the καὶ γνωρίσω, ver. 26, the expression is interpreted into its full depth of meaning; it is declared that that holy name is not entirely *made known* until in the unity of perfection the whole love of God in Christ, and nothing but this love, dwells, lives, and is glorified also in the sanctified and saved. So far those expositors are right who make the common formula *the name of God* equivalent to *the nature of God itself*—throughout the Scriptures, and also here. It must not, however, be overlooked, that according to the principle and the origin of this phrase the *name* signifies the *nature* as far as it is *cognisable* and *capable of name*. From this the word here sets out:—the commencing φανερουν is placed in contradiction to the previous obscurity of the Old Testament; it is not yet the full γνωρίζειν, but is a *beginning* of it; and, as such, is shown by the sequel to have been effected through the *word* given by Him and kept

Hosted by Google

by the disciples. Christ first *preached* and testified *concerning the Father* (ch. xvi. 25)—in His own person He brought down and unfolded this great word, teaching man how he may and why he should call God his Father.[1] The question concerning the *name* of God had been hitherto answered by the inconceivable יהוה, which the awe of the far-off worshippers dared not even pronounce, and which rather repelled, therefore, than satisfied the inquiry: but now *eternal being* is plainly revealed to be *eternal love.* When by the sending of the Son, the distinction which had existed from eternity in the living love of the Divine nature itself was disclosed, and the mystery of the Trinity which had found no expression in the unity of the name *Jehovah* was brought to light—then appeared the *kindness and love* toward man of God *our Saviour*,[2] and then "a personal, absolute *principle of love* became revealed as the distinguishing idea of the Divine essence."[3] This is assuredly the proper meaning of the *Father-name* as disclosed *by the Son* also to men, in which the life-giving knowledge of the only true God both discloses itself and closes all revelation:—beyond this name and its appropriate honour the creature has nothing further to know, to confess, and to praise. Schmieder, although he sets out with a profound but general interpretation of "name," yet says at the close—"Thus understood and acknowledged the Father-name is the perfect name of God simply." In all other apprehension of God, as Tholuck says, letters and syllables only of His name are heard. We more truly understand τὸ ὄνομα thus, most certainly, than if we should dismiss it, with B.-Crusius, by "the confession of Thee"—for the question here is *what* and *who* God is to be known and confessed to be. The Father-name brought to us by Christ "is the true name by which man may know God, that is, see and feel His heart, His will, and His work." (Luther.) But in what way did Christ first and alone reveal this name? Assuredly, by His word or

[1] Hence Nonnus is not essentially wrong—οὔνομα σὸν κήρυξα.

[2] The Jehovah-name is glorified in the Jesus-name, as the New Testament ὁ κύριος would indicate.

[3] As Kling says—or Braune, somewhat differently: "As the immeasurable principle of love, as the holy and good Father, who inclines to the creatures dependent on Him, with unfathomable *compassion.*

Hosted by Google

words, as Himself says; but this does not mean through His *doctrine* or *teaching* as such—as if nothing more was necessary than to tell men, and help their reason to apprehend, as the blind Rationalists say, that God is a loving and compassionate Father. It is the most lying desecration of this all-holy name, to detach the Son's teaching concerning the good Father above from all those other doctrines which He taught as the foundation or qualification of that truth. For He did not first and at once declare the Father to be the general Father of compassion without any mediation; but He announced Him *first* to be His own, the Son's Father, and then ours, because He hath given to us the Son. The word concerning the Father was at the same time a word concerning the Son; a self-testimony to the personality of this Jesus Christ. Thus, not properly speaking by His doctrine, but *in His person*, from the time of His incarnation, to which the works and words bare witness, as the sent One *in whom is the name of God* (Ex. xxiii. 21) as the covenant-Angel come,—did He reveal the name of the Father as eternal Love. Finally, and it must be carefully noted, in this *I have manifested* there lies the same great *prolepsis* which pervades the whole prayer; for the prophetic office was glorified in the fruit of a clear and living knowledge by the *Spirit*, commencing in preludes from the day of the resurrection itself. The risen Lord, now first Himself justified and glorified as the Son, announces in His first words to His *brethren*, Jno. xx. 17, the name of *His* Father and *their* Father for the first time in all its distinctness—as it was predicted in Ps. xxii. 23, comp. Heb. ii. 11, 12. And all this is here anticipated and included. The Ἐγώ must have its emphasis, though not expressed, in the ἐφανέρωσα (as it stood prominently before the ἐδόξασα and ἐτελείωσα), (Matt. xi. 27); for it must not be forgotten that the word, work, and life of the Son of God *upon earth*, before He returns to heaven, fulfils as one great collective self-testimony of that *Person* who is *the Son*, the so-called prophetic office of the Redeemer.

Unto the men—thus after ver. 5 the glorified Son of God speaks as if from above; appropriates Himself and in Himself the Father *specifically* to these children of men, whose brother He has become and will be for ever. Lampe rightly says, cum

Hosted by Google

exclusione angelorum; for this is now the permanent pre-eminence of the Adamic creature over all other "children of God," even the "morning stars" (Job xxxviii. 7), that they through Christ have God as in the most direct and essential manner their Father. In the κόσμος of ver. 5 all creatures were included and surveyed; but the Lord's contemplation now descends to the *world of mankind* to whom he belongs—and in this restricted sense he says, ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. Even the *Apostles*, who were first referred to, are no other than *men* given to Him out of the world (which knoweth not the Father, ver. 25, and to which they also by nature belonged). But this universal expression presently teaches us, that the Intercessor, standing as it were on high, already regarded in them the representatives of *all* men generally who should ever be given to Him.[1] Whom Thou hast given[2] Me out of the world—thus does ver. 2 look back to and connect itself with ch. xv. 19. "With what complacency and how often does Jesus mention in this prayer that the Father had given Him *all!* In the Father's presence He keeps perfect silence as to His own electing energy (ch. xv. 16), by which He had made the disciples His own." (Schmieder.) But what is involved in this *giving* is plainly unfolded in the following clause, which forms the *point of transition* between the disciples' having *before* been *of the world* and their *now being* Christ's.

Thine they were—it is idle to understand this as if it meant, As Thy creatures, like the whole world; or even, with Richter, "like all men, in the love of Thy compassion." For ἐκ τοῦ κοσμοῦ means not the world, in as far as it is God's; nor does the Father unconditionally give any man to His Son from the evil world. Hezel's note is very unworthy: "that which I would give must be Mine—all these men were Thine, created by Thee—Thou couldst thus give them unto Me!" and the predestinarian turn which another writer gives it, is nothing less

[1] "He uses so general an expression concerning them, because He beheld in them the first fruits of those who should in future be given to Him." (Rieger.)

[2] Lachmann's ἔδωκας everywhere in vers. 6–8, instead of δέδωκας (only in ver. 8, δέδωκα αὐτοῖς), may safely be preferred; as these better unfold the aorist-historical procedure toward the final result.

Hosted by Google

than blasphemous, "Thou couldst put them to any use Thou wouldst!"[1] And yet we read in more than one exposition, "They were Thine by eternal election." We think that, as chap. vi. 37, 44, 45, defined the giving of the Father to be a preparatory drawing to the Son, *Thine they were* can here mean no other than this preparation and drawing over from the world to the Son—which may be regarded as the economy of the Father before the kingdom of the Son is set up. Is, then, this *Thine they were* in its widest sense equivalent to the being *of God*, chap. viii. 47, or *of the truth*, as even a heathen, according to chap. xviii. 37, might be? We regard the fundamental principle as the same, but this cannot suffice for the meaning in its reference to the *Apostles* (and those then included with them); for the necessary complement in their case seems to be —They were Thine as *under the Old Testament!* This work of the Father preparing for and leading to Christ must find its recognition somewhere in this prayer; for it was already intimated in ver. 3. Indeed, all who were the children of Abraham according to the flesh, and united in the fellowship of the covenant of law and promise, were so far *God's*, and were to be given to Him again in Christ. (Matt. xxii. 21.) But the greater part were unwilling and unfit for this, because the truth of their covenant relation had been annulled in them, and Israel itself had become a κόσμος. Consequently, the Old Testament preparation is here regarded only as far as it was a *reality;* the disciples of Jesus had previously been genuine, sincere Israelites, the *escaped or reserved* in Israel, Isa. iv. 2—the holy seed, ch. vi. 13. So that we agree with Rieger in the issue, "they were the Father's, not only as His creatures and the heirs of the covenant with the fathers, but also as good hearts yielding to the discipline and drawing of God."

[1] The view of the Berlenb. Bibel is incorrect from another point, and is, moreover, altogether alien to the context: "They were Thine, in Thine eternal Fatherly counsel, from the creation," it explains, and then farther illustrates, thus: "First, Thou hadst right in and claim upon them as Creator, and they upon Thee—which a penitent may plead against original sin. Secondly: They lay shut up under Thy Fatherly severity—they have been delivered to Me by the hand of justice, that I might set them at one with Thee again." All this is either vague, or incorrect, or inappropriate to the connexion.

Hosted by Google

This holds good in the fullest sense of the *Apostles*, whom the Lord has here *primarily* in view, and then of the greater part of His first disciples. He did not, as some seem to think, translate even the Apostles by a sudden conversion out of the midst of the publicans and sinners. And in the case of others, where there might appear to be a sudden, instantaneous, and immediate election out of the world, there had been in reality an analogous work of transition, or preparatory drawing of the Father:—it was not wanting even in the instance of Saul, despite all appearances. And we may extend this further, and seek the deeper principle which underlies even the Old-Testament preparation, as the Father's giving to Christ. Thus Meyer, "Conversion to Jesus Christ is wont to be preceded by an awakened sense for God and right, *an old covenant*, whence follows the actual drawing of the Father to the Son." Better to say that this awakening is itself the drawing. For, as Braune says, "General piety, whether Jewish or Gentile, is a thread which leads into the kingdom of Christ. *He who feareth God is accepted of Him.* Scorn not, therefore, any piety or fear of God, though it be not yet Christian."

With the *propter electionem*, by which, of course, Lampe explains *Thine they were*, we need not trouble ourselves much; since even the concluding clause of the verse, and more particularly ver. 8, refers the decision to the men themselves, to their receiving His word, their knowing, and believing. It might appear, indeed, as if *and they have kept Thy word* indicated the gradual progress of the disciples' faith in Christ, and even their perseverance in faith. This must be included, since He is here presenting them to the Father as having continued till now His own, the fruit of His mission; but we think, furthermore, that this concluding clause looks back upon, and is the summary of the whole past; bringing forward the human decision of these men, as the *other side* not only of *Thou gavest them to Me*, but also of the first *Thine they were*. It might indeed be thought that τὸν λόγον σου is parallel with τὸ ὄνομά σου, and expounded again by the ῥήματα of ver. 8. But, remembering that Jesus uses, throughout these final discourses, the formula τὸν λόγον μου τηρεῖν (ch. xiv. 23, etc.), we are inclined to regard this emphatic and peculiar λόγον σου as includ-

Hosted by Google

ing the Old-Testament, preparatory word of God, and τηρεῖν as being, in a general sense, the acceptation, and observance, and holding fast of that word.[1] It is then the correlative of ch. v. 38; and at the same time an explanation of the *giving* of the Father as being their *learning* of Him—similarly to ch. vi. 44, 45. This view seems best to accord with the general sense of the words which describe these men, taken out of the world, as having been believers and worthy from the beginning until now. So Luther accepts it: "They were Thine, He says; and it is as if He should say, Whosoever heareth the word, openeth his ears and his heart, and lets God's revelation penetrate his soul, belongs no longer to the world, but (in due course) to Me!" And he further goes on to show how far we may assure ourselves of being God's, by the manner and sincerity of our own hearing and keeping of His word.

Vers. 7, 8. This *now* makes prominent the New Testament position which the disciples had reached; and here is the connection which Lücke finds wanting. He also regards the development of the thought as too loose, and cannot see for what purpose "this evolution of the nature and origin of the disciples' faith" is introduced; finding, further, in all this, evidence of the Evangelist's composition. He is good enough, however, to allow that this process of thought might not be altogether alien to the praying spirit, and that "the composition may be justified on that ground!" We earnestly beg this excellent expositor to weigh these words well in a second edition, and if possible remove them; for they cannot but be offensive to many readers of his commentary who think the composition of St John above any human judgment, and further believe that the Spirit of inspiration has actually reproduced the very prayer of the Son of God in this chapter. For ourselves, we find here in every word a most worthy meaning, thoughts the unfolding of which is perfectly harmonious. Ver. 7 in connection with ver. 6 rises again from the specific to the general view of Christ's work, returns to the revelation of the Father-

[1] *Including* the O. T. word, not that alone. Alford supposes me to mean the latter, and objects that its place would have been, in that case, *before* the δέδωκας. My meaning is that the Lord speaks comprehensively and in a transitional way of both—as it were proleptically for vers. 7, 8.

Hosted by Google

name, and explains it—Now know they *Thee in Me*, the Father in the Son. In *πάντα ὅσα* the entire testimony of His works to His person is summed up in one; but then, in the sense which we have often expounded, the *ῥήματα*, as the basis and test of the knowledge of faith, are brought forward into prominence. According to ch. vii. 17, xii. 44–50 this is the beginning of faith in Christ,—to acknowledge His word as given Him of God, to accept and admit this testimony, to let it abide and give it room in the heart, and thus to keep it. That the *knowing* here precedes the *believing* is strictly consistent with ver. 3; and shows decisively that the Lord in this intercession for His disciples admits no other faith than that which is based on knowledge.[1] All the words given to Him of the Father, He had given to them—just as in chap. xv. 15 and elsewhere. We think that in this most solemn final testimony the Lord makes direct allusion to that important passage, Deut. xviii. 18, 19. He thereby refers, by tacit opposition, to the opposing and doomed unbelief of all those who would *not* hear and receive the words which the Father had put in His mouth, and which He had spoken in His name. But He also thereby declares the work which He had already accomplished to be that fulfilment and consummation of the *prophetic* office which Moses there predicted. All the *individual* words which He had spoken He sums up and seals, in His Father's presence, in these *ῥήματα* given by Him to be received by man.

When He now bears joyful witness before the Father to the understanding faith of His beloved disciples, He quotes, as it were, and confirms their own literal confession in chap. xvi. 30—yea, He dignifies their albeit weak *πιστεύομεν* into an *ἔγνωσαν*. We doubt whether Fikenscher's distinction of the two parallel clauses is tenable: he says, "rightly is the relation to *Christ* called a *knowing*, to the *Father* a *believing*." For, *παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον* and *σύ με ἀπέστειλας* reciprocally explain each other as perfect correlatives; the latter, however, less profound in its expression, being added in order graciously

[1] Ἔγνωκα is found in many MSS.—a strange error of the old copyists, followed even by the Syr. There can be no imaginable place found for *νῦν ἔγνωκα*, as referred to our Lord, least of all in this prayer.

Hosted by Google

to include all commencing faith, that namely which might apprehend His being sent but not yet His proceeding from the Father—before He goes on to say, For these and all like them *I pray!* Both, however, are united in one—They believe *on Me*—as it is said afterward in ver. 20. For His name alone, as the name of the Son, avails to all men under heaven for the knowledge of the name of the Father. The ἀληθῶς which is significantly added to *they have known*, and which is to be referred also to *they have believed*, has a tone of gracious encouragement as proceeding from the lips of the Searcher of hearts; but it seems also, as preceding "I pray *for them*" to contain a warning rejection of all self-imagined or hypocritical believing and knowing. It may also be compared with the בֶּאֱמֶת of Ps. cxlv. 18. Well for us, if we do not merely utter our own *we have believed* and *we have known*, but are also *acknowledged* before the Father by the ἀληθῶς of His Son!

Ver. 9. That which He had promised in Matt. x. 32, He begins now to fulfil; as well as what He had said in John xiv. 16—I will *ask* the Father for you; we therefore plainly perceive that that denial of any intercession, which had intervened in ch. xvi. 26, 27, has a sense by no means inconsistent with this. As the High Priest, who has no sign of His own, yea, whose own infirmity itself became the power of God in Him for the world's redemption, He has hitherto only *presented* His own person and work in the Father's presence, and the disciples only as they are the fruit of that work which He brings with Him. The twice-spoken *glorify Me* was less a petition than a claim, resting upon ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα and καὶ νῦν,—a confident expectation, consistent with the testimony which He had uttered concerning the whole relation between the Father and Himself. But now, as the Representative of weak and sinful men, He uses for the first time an express ἐρωτῶ[1]—this, however, being dignified by the Ἐγώ which emphatically precedes. All that we have heard, in the discourses which prepare for this prayer, concerning the distinction, now made perfect, between believers and the world, must be applied to our understanding of the

[1] The critical distinction between which and αἰτῶ has been referred to on chap. xiv. 16 and xvi. 26.

Hosted by Google

sense in which Jesus here rigidly distinguishes His praying for His own from His praying for the world. For that He does not deny and renounce all prayer for the world, is as certain as that He now offers that intercession for His own which nevertheless He had before relatively denied. The prayer for His enemies upon the cross, the testimony of the Holy Spirit in subsequent apostolical teaching (Heb. vii. 25), yea, the very close itself of *this* prayer, vers. 20, 21, 23, all declare His intercession for the world. Not indeed for *the* world which continues because it will continue in its ungodly character, which therefore receiveth not the Spirit of truth, and *can* never "come unto God through Him" (hence this limitation in Heb. vii. 25)—but still for all who should believe, and even for the weighty testimony of believers *in order that* the world may believe and know. Thus an unconditional exclusion of the world from Christ's intercession is contrary to the mind of Christ and the entire Scripture: as certainly and as universally as He died for all, He mediates for all; for His intercession is the fruit, consequence, and power of His redeeming work. Calvin and those who follow him find in this *I pray not for the world* their *decretum reprobationis* pronounced upon the *vasa iræ;* but what we have already said renders any further refutation of this unnecessary. Lampe's frightful conclusion is perfectly *perverse:* "When Jesus thus excludes them from His intercession, He declares that He is not their High Priest, and therefore that He was *not about to die for them.* For these are the two inseparable offices of the High Priest, and they have an equal extent of operation. And the rather is this true, as it would have been a much less thing to pray for sinners than to die for them. Hence we may argue here from the less to the greater." This is to place one single misunderstood word in opposition to the simplest, clearest, most abundant testimonies of Scripture. Luther at first seemed, alas, to assent to this (in his exposition of Jno. xvii.): "From this nothing can follow but that they must be altogether lost, as those of whom *Christ will know nothing.*" But in another place he corrects himself: "To pray for the world, and not to pray for the world, must both be right in their place. For He afterwards says Himself, ver. 20—*for them also which shall believe.* But these must be

Hosted by Google

as yet of the world, and therefore He must pray for the world, on account of those who should be brought out of it." (See the whole passage in Tholuck.) Since the believing and the coming to Him rests finally in our own decision—that, however, being possible only through the power which has been obtained by Him and extended to us[1]—it cannot be but that the intercession of Him who "willeth not that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance" (2 Pet. iii. 9), should actually apply to the *whole* world, *in order that* all may be able to believe, if they will. During the great term of long forbearance before the final decision, He maketh intercession for the transgressors (Isa. liii. 12), restraining judgment, demanding faith and offering its blessings to man. If we say to the believer, He prayeth for thee, that thy faith fail not—so may we say to the unbeliever, He prayeth for thee, that thou mayest believe! The conflict between the Divine will and the freedom of man, which is solved by the prescience of the issue, but without any reprobating predestination, enters deeply into the High-priestly prayer, as we shall see upon ver. 12.

A well-meaning distinction is generally introduced here—I pray not *now*, in this place, for the world; but this is certainly insufficient, and the correction is better which reads, I pray not *in this manner* for the world. For in its connection with vers. 6–8, the word means, first—I pray not indeed for such as are unworthy, but for such as have become Thine, who have already believed; but as such He could not present the world to the Father, that He might regard them with complacency, defend and love them like His own. It has been said, This is the Testament, and none but the heirs are spoken of; but we would add more specifically, None but those who have already entered into the inheritance. "The prayer of Christ for the world takes quite a different form from that for the Church. The *former* is to the effect that the world may cease to be what it is; the *latter*, that the Church may be perfected in that which it

[1] B.-Crusius does not understand this: "The theological question as to how this power could be *prayed for*, whereas man himself is appealed to as having it in his own decision, concerns not the Spirit of the New Testament, etc." O no, all is actually prayed for and obtained by prayer; but not for the irresistible constraint of a free creature.

Hosted by Google

has received into itself." (Olshausen.) The prophetic word, Ps. xvi. 3, 4, where certainly priestly intercession may be admitted,[1] has the same sense as here, the exclusion of the world from the specific complacency of approving intercession. As the typical high priest prayed only for Israel, bore only the twelve tribes on his breastplate, so there is a corresponding prayer of the eternal High Priest only for the true people of God—which, however, by no means excludes the calling of the Gentiles to enter into the true Israel. It is altogether in harmony with the Apostle's word, 1 Tim. iv. 10, which has its force for the prayers of the Church also—He is the Saviour of all men, *specially* of them that believe. "Every one enters into the precious privilege of this *special* intercession, so soon as he opens his heart for the acceptance and observance of the words of Christ as widely as the disciples did in their years of pupilage." (Rieger.) All others, as long as their unbelief and hatred of God is not yet perfect, and they do not altogether *know what they do*, their repentance unto remission being possible, partake in the "Father, forgive them!" of the cross, and the continuous energy of Gospel testimony which is the fruit of His intercession—that the world may believe.

Concerning those who already believe, those already given to Him, the Lord says once more to the Father—*For they are Thine!* That does not mean merely, They *were*, they became Thine, therefore Thou couldst give them to Me; but it refers to their present condition, They *are* and continue Thine even as given to Me; by Me they are to be fully given back to Thyself. This is established by what follows.

Ver. 10. This leads us back to ch. xvi. 15. But what a word of majesty and Divine power to be found in *prayer* before God! "It would not have been so much if He had said simply, All that which is Mine, is Thine. For every one may say that all he has is God's. But He inverts the words, and says, All that which is Thine, is Mine. No creature could thus speak before God." (Luther.) Yes, truly, this πάντα—not πάντες—includes the eternal Divinity, and changes the prayer into a free, rightful, and unrestricted taking from the fulness, power, and

[1] Which we now fully admit, though it was denied in the Com. on Psalms.

Hosted by Google

love of the Father—in whose presence He can say, We are One! But the conclusion, *And I am glorified in them*, goes yet further, And all that which is Thine and Mine belongs *also to them*. So that every Christian may, in the joyful confidence of faith, utter the same word to Christ, All that is Thine is mine! (1 Cor. iii. 21–23.) It is obvious, again, that the Son presents His disciples to the Father as those in whom He Himself already lived. Grotius: itaque in ipsorum personâ mea res vertitur. De Wette and Stolz very incorrectly translate, I am glorified *by* them! This *by them* (which cannot be found in the ἐν) was yet entirely in the future; but the glorification of the Lord *in them* had already its living commencement, so that He could presuppose and build upon their future in anticipation. Certainly, there was much wanting to the full truth and reality of this δεδόξασμαι, as Schmieder says, "He knew that the revelation of Himself in their minds was still exposed to many obscurations, and that He was not yet fully glorified in them"—but the Lord confidently looks forward to its consummation.[1] For He had declared in vers. 6–8 the foundation to have been fully laid; but this is a wonderful prolepsis, as of the justifying and sanctifying good pleasure of God toward us in Christ, so also of our own apprehending faith,—the consummation being regarded in the beginning. We need not, therefore, qualify the words, as Bengel himself does, Tales se præbuerunt, in quibus glorificarer. The Lord contemplates the end and issue, in its first principle, by anticipation.

Ver. 11. But now comes the development of the specific object of His intercession, *what* He prays for on behalf of these *men* who are His:—their being kept, that is, to the sure consummation of that *glorification of Christ in them* which had now begun. They are as yet men *in the world*, although given to Him out of the world, and "*the Saviour well knew what it was to be in the world!*" (Hofacker.) This last feeling is in the sympathising heart of the High Priest, when He says first, anticipating already the victory—I am no more in the world. He

[1] "Which is the more wonderful, the Lord's consciousness of His fellowship with the Father, or His glance into the future of these weak disciples?" (Braune.) Who but He could have seen in these Eleven the teachers of the world, the overturners of Heathenism, the foundations of the Church?

Hosted by Google

no more, but they still in the world—both to be understood not so much concerning the place as the *condition*. The thoughts which proceed so peacefully in their mutual qualifications, flow also from the mighty impulses of equally deep feeling. And therefore the Lord, standing upon the threshold and conscious of the way which He has yet to walk, limits by *I come*[1] the *I am no more in the world*. Although in some degree still remaining in them, He yet *leaves* His beloved disciples on going to the Father! And this thought touches His heart with the feeling of all *their* future *need*. His personal presence with them in the flesh was "a protecting might"—see ch. xvi. 4. But now was needed the power and protection of the Father, through the Spirit to be obtained by Jesus for men. His intercession is, therefore, properly, the promised prayer for the sending of the Holy Ghost.

As He thus comes to the Father (πρός σε) and presents Himself before Him, He uses in His invocation that all-holy name (by the Pope so miserably desecrated!) which here *alone* is found in the lips of Jesus—*Holy Father!* This is assuredly something different from and more than the subsequent *Righteous Father!* ver. 25. Both appellatives are added for the sake of the disciples whom He prays for; for He never used any such in addressing His Father on His own behalf. The *holiness* of God, a word which pervades the whole Scripture,[2] is but little understood and often very inadequately explained. There is in it, indeed, something transcendent, which cannot be reproduced in any other words;[3] and even the classical expressions which correspond to it have in the obscurity of their etymology, and the amplitude of their application, *something* of the same character as the dark and mysterious scriptural

[1] For in ver. 13 we perceive that Jesus well knows Himself to be still in the world. His words go now backward, now forward. (Schmieder.)

[2] Yet (as Achelis observes) this previously frequent attribute of God is rare in the N. T. He is right, but says incorrectly that the only passages are Jno. xvii. 11; 1 Pet. i. 16 (ver. 15 too); and Rev. iv. 8. He forgets Lu. i. 49; 1 Jno. ii. 20; in the Revelation ch. vi. 10 (iii. 7), xv. 4, xvi. 5, and also Heb. xii. 10.

[3] As Harms in his well-known 36th Thesis boldly challenged: Let him who can master by his reason the first letter of all religion, that is, the word "holy," come forward and declare it to me!

Hosted by Google

קָדוֹשׁ. But the Bible, when the whole of it is appealed to, gives us light enough for the rejection of every false and insufficient meaning. It is plain that *not merely* purity or separation from all evil (justitia interna, *ἀναμαρτησία* Dei) is the idea of God's holiness; for then would it be one with His righteousness. Nor is it *merely* the incomparable, unapproachable *onliness* of God which is meant (as it were the *tremenda* majestas); for it is the joy of His worshippers to call Him Holy, and, still more, we also are to be made holy as He is holy! Men exhaust themselves in all kinds of indistinct imaginings about this dread mystery; and when they speak of "*the majesty of grace*," come nearer perhaps to a right feeling of its import. Lücke interprets it in this place as "the power of God which preserves the good in the world from being defiled and dissipated:" this appears to be deduced from the context, but needs to be explained, and even to be modified, since the Holy One condescends in His sanctifying power even to sinners. B.-Crusius: "*ἅγιος* is He who is exalted above the world, *saving out of it*." This also is a right feeling after the truth; but the great point is that which mediates between these two clauses—it is the condescending love itself which shows Him to be thus exalted.

We have on many passages already avowed that the primary truth in Menken's otherwise one-sided view must be regarded as strictly scriptural—God is holy in His condescending, compassionate, saving *love*. The two great words, God is holy—God is love, are assuredly correlative. We cannot at the outset do other than repeat what we said upon the Epistle to the Hebrews (Th. ii. S. 306), "God is holy, that is, *exalted* in His ineffable and incomparable *praiseworthiness above all praise of* the creature, while He in pure love condescends to the creature, even to His fallen creatures, in order to re-establish in them *this* His honour and glory, that He is love." That He as absolute *purity* cannot be hurt or touched by the evil of sin, but remains sublime above the *world*, is certainly *the first idea from which the word proceeds*, but is far from being the only thing which Revelation discloses to us in this expression; for the Lord presently declares Himself to be holy in this and through this, that *His love is sanctified again even in the unholy*, and He by this condescension to us is raised still higher for our adoration. Conse-

Hosted by Google

quently, it is not so much in itself, in the circle of angelic intelligences, and in the heavenly light of the pure creation, as *in and among men* that His holiness is displayed :—where He draws nigh to sinners, to bless and unite them to Himself, there is the קָדֹושׁ, in the temple as before in the holy ground, Ex. iii. 5. *Therefore* the Seraphim call Him Holy in *that* sanctuary from which His glory should go forth over *all the earth.* Isa. vi. The devils and the damned reach not to the acknowledgment and sense of His holiness; in hell they feel no more than that He is almighty, omniscient, *just!* Where the praise of His *love* dwells, there alone is heard *Holy!* That in קָדוֹשׁ the idea of such condescension is distinctive and essential, is taught by Isaiah's קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, which would otherwise have no meaning;—for the normal passage, among many, we may refer to Isa. xli. 14. See, moreover, Ps. xxii. 4–7, lxxxix. 16–19, ciii. 1, but especially the entire Ps. xcix. vers. 1–5 of which fore-announce a proper exposition of the holiness of God, which is given vers. 6–9. All these, and many similar passages, are not to be summarily explained by that old first notion, which, strangely enough, that enlightened inquirer, Meyer, retains—"Separate from all that is evil and impure, and unapproachable by it; *hence* supremely to be honoured, and above all possibility of being injured, inviolable in sanctity." Nor are they to be satisfied by "the most perfect accordance between His will and His knowledge"—or the like.[1] Are passages desired which almost explicitly make *holy* equivalent to merciful, redeeming, forgiving? Weigh well the simple connection in Mary's song of praise, Lu. i. 49, 50, compared with Isa. lvii. 15, 16; Ps. cii. 20, 21. We would unceasingly urge these latter passages upon all who cannot reconcile themselves to the incontrovertible scriptural interpretation of this word. But most decisive appears to us, finally, Hos. xi. 8, 9, when rightly read, where we hear in express terms,—I will not execute the fierceness of Mine anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim: *for* I am God and not man; the *Holy One* in the midst of thee, and I will not come with wrath![2]

[1] For instance, Kahnis says almost oracularly: "In the knowledge of Himself wise, in His own will holy, in His own love blessed."

[2] Here is "love the ground-tone of the word." The *holiness* of God is not opposed to a wrath "which not so restrained would cease to be Divine".

Hosted by Google

Thus much then is certain, that in all these passages of Scripture the fundamental idea of the word is that of merciful, condescending, wrath-restraining Love. We cannot altogether, however, agree with Menken that *holy* and *merciful* are synonymous; nor would we say with him that the word expresses only the self-abasing love or lowliness of God! Most assuredly God is holy *also* in His anger, in His judgments, in the unchangeable truth of His nature, which permits Him not to forgive the sinners to whom He is merciful without chastisement of their sin, the taking away of their evil, and revelation of His own righteousness:—and of this Ps. xcix. 8 might be taken as a normal passage which gives its solution. *Holy* love, with all its compassion of condescension, retains its enmity and opposition to the evil as such; though this concomitant consequence is by no means the *fundamental idea*, as Schöberlein says, "the essential self-preserving attitude of God's personality as opposed to the sinner."[1] For God is in Scripture termed holy, not in His opposition to the sinner, but as stooping to him—"drawing nigh to Israel," as Achelis says. How otherwise could we ever become holy? How could the application of the word pass, as it does in the New Testament, from God to us, if its fundamental idea was the self-defence of God against sin? Nitzsch comes nearest to the truth, on *this* side of the question, when he says, "not saving and condescending love in itself is the idea of the Divine holiness, but the correcting *truth of love* which in this condescension and self-communication punishes the evil." But we would substitute —Not so much the former as the latter, not the former alone, God is not merely holy in the unity of His love with His truth and righteousness; but, inasmuch as love in Him (to speak humanly) restrains the wrath of His punitive justice, and, as in Hosea, overcomes it, He may be said not to leave man to His judgment until all the methods of mercy are exhausted. Hence

(as Münchmeyer says), but to the fierceness of a righteous wrath already kindled.

[1] Comp. in Schmieder, S. 125, and S. u. K. 1847. i., the whole tractate of Achelis, who finally admits that "Menken paved the way for a true understanding of the word." Sartorius falls back again upon the favourite "self-preserving purity," and adds (S. u. K. 1847. iv. S. 1002), "Redemption is not based upon the holiness of love, but upon compassion!" but this can hardly be reconciled with Lu. i. 49, 50.

Hosted by Google

the acknowledgment of His *holiness* is the last and greatest tribute in the glorification of His works,—after "Righteous in all His ways" comes "Holy in all His works" (where, indeed, we have חָסִיד, most fitly instead of קָדוֹשׁ—making this meaning most clear). Thus God, finally, as the Merciful One, who is at the same time just and true in this communication of His saving love, abides for ever the only God, worthy of all praise, to be adored with the deepest reverence (hence sometimes the נוֹרָא is connected with the קָדוֹשׁ)—but this holiness in its fullest and profoundest sense has its New-Testament disclosure in the equally sublime and condescending *Father-name*. And thus the formula which Christ here uses—*Holy Father*—condenses the Old and New Testament expressions into one, uniting the deepest word of the past revelation with the new name which was now to be revealed, and both being one in their meaning. Let us weigh attentively Heb. xii. 5–10, where the paternal *holiness of the Father* of spirits, of which we are to be partakers, is presented to us as the union of paternal love with the judicial (and properly speaking equally *paternal*) severity against sin. We would say, with Liebner; "*Love* is the *positive* essence of holiness which only takes for granted the negative; in saying *summa in Deo puritas—what* is denied and excluded? Essentially all evil, that is, all *selfishness*, and therefore all *negation of love*" (Christologie i. 108). Once more, *not* "the self-preservation of God, notwithstanding His condescension" (Schmieder), but rather His *condescension* in conjunction with His self-preservation, and even in order to it—for the securing of His highest honour.

It is, consequently, as humbly praying in the name of the sinners whose Representative He is, and at the same time as confidently speaking in His own name, that Jesus appeals to the holy Paternity, and paternal Holiness of God, for the preservation and defence, and (what is inseparable from it) for the progressive purification and sanctification of His dependents. Keep them *in Thy name*—on which Francke says simply, "which name He had even now named," and this precisely expresses the sense. It is certainly wrong to interpret here, *through* Thy name,[1]

[1] In the English Bible we find in ver. 11 *through Thine own name:* and Wesley both in ver. 11 and ver. 12, *through Thy name.*

Hosted by Google

that is, by Thy power—through Thine aid, Chrys., Theophyl., Euthym. And equally incorrect that which Klee prefers—for Thine own sake. For we must hold fast the connection with ver. 6; and ver. 12 plainly expresses the meaning. The abiding in the knowledge of the revealed name, the abiding with and in God, is meant, and nothing else. Luther: "This is to be kept in the name of God, to keep His word pure and living in our hearts. For this is God's name, or honour, or praise, that He should be thus known and acknowledged, etc." Looking still more intently upon it, we may say that Christ, who bears in Himself and brings to the world the name of the Father, prays as if He should say, Keep them *in Me!*

With this *seems* very well to agree the reading ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι which is generally preferred to οὓς—. It must be admitted that οὓς has for it the weakest authorities (only Cod. D., and there as an emendation, with some of the versions, where it might have passed over from ver. 6), while ᾧ was received generally by the ancients.[1] But internal criticism will not allow *us* to regard the ᾧ with many "as a reading which commends itself." For what could it mean *here*, that the Father had *given His name* to Christ? Alford replies by saying, "The *name* of God is that which was to be *in the Angel of the Covenant*, Exod. xxiii. 21, see also Isa. ix. 6; Jer. xxiii. 6." But this Old Testament and obscure expression could not be found interposed in the full unfolded simplicity of *this* prayer, with any meaning χριστοπρεπῶς. We would further ask, What could it mean *here?* here where the *Father-name* is introduced? Such superficiality as that of de Wette, "which, that is, the revelation of which Thou hast intrusted to Me," and all kindred interpretations, condemn themselves as opposed to that deep meaning of *name* which we cannot but recognise here. Such an one is that of Hess—"of which Thou hast thought Me worthy (to be called Thy Son)!" The *Father* did indeed give His word and His words to the *Son*, for His work upon earth, in the flesh; but that He had given His *name* also to Him (first *revealed* to the Son, as then by the Son to us?) is opposed alike to the essential unity *and* the essential distinction between the Son and the Father. Nor are we

[1] Semler's conjecture ὡς deserves no remark.

Hosted by Google

helped by Schmieder's—Keep them in Thy name, *through which* Thou hast given them to Me! The disciples being represented in the same clause as *in* the name *through* which they were given to Me![1] This reading, therefore, will admit of no kind of consistent exposition. Nevertheless, we would not retain the very slenderly supported reading *οὕς*; but agree with Bengel, who gives the reading ὃ the preference.[2] Not referring, however, this ὃ to *ὄνομα*, but in the same sense of *comprehensiveness* in the neuter as the *πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας* connected with the *αὐτοῖς*, in ver. 2. This is strongly supported also, as Bengel observes, by the *ἓν* which immediately follows; and in ver. 24 we have the same reading recurring, *ὃ δέδωκάς με*, which plainly shows that it was not referred to the *ὄνομα* by those who introduced it. Thus the *ἕν* is an allusion to the *πᾶν* of the earlier verse:—Keep them in Thy name, (all) *that which* Thou hast given Me, that this All may be *One*. This very unusual, but profound, collocation of ὃ with *αὐτοὺς*, has misled the copyists, though ver. 2 might have assisted them to understand it. Hence the various readings.[3]

That they *may be One!* Here at the commencement of the interceding *τήρησον*—before the specific development of their *defence* against evil, and sanctification in the truth, which follows vers. 12–19—the prayer glances forward for a moment to the great *end* of their preservation, as it is made prominent afterward in a new paragraph, vers. 21–23. It is obviously to be understood, One among themselves, because one with Me and Thee, with Us. But now the unity of believers is by an absolute *as* placed in comparison with the unity of the Father and the Son—this application being as bold as the exalted *ἡμεῖς*, and unless *this* equality be justified, *too* bold! How is this *as* to be rightly understood? But the Father and the Son are in the *ὁμοουσία* one in an essentially different sense from that in which

[1] Better than this would be Lange's *In which* Thou hast given them to Me! if only the *ᾧ* could be taken literally for *ἐν ᾧ*!

[2] We do not regard this, with Lücke, to have originated from the *ᾧ*; but, conversely, the *attraction* was a grammatical correction which misunderstood the meaning.

[3] We cannot see how the plural *ᾧσιν* opposes (as Luthardt thinks) the application to the disciples; but refer again, and more expressly, to ver. 2.

Hosted by Google

we can be one with each other or one with God in Christ. Certainly, in ch. x. 30, where the ἕν ἐσμεν laid the strong emphasis upon the unity of power, and thus absolutely of the Divine nature, such a juxtaposition could have no place; but here in the *as we are one* the ὁμόνοια alone is prominent, and in that sense our unity will admit of comparison, just as our serving, loving, and dying for the brethren, may be compared with the self-sacrifice of Christ. (See, *e.g.*, that impressive passage, Eph. v. 25–28.) This is the first explanation, but it by no means exhausts the meaning of our Lord's prayer that they may *be one;* for He not only compares this union by the *as* with the union of the Father and the Son, but unites it inseparably with the latter, and makes that its foundation. (Ver. 21. *And they in us.*—Ver. 22. *I in them.) By this the one is not reduced,*[1] *but the other is exalted:*—this is the often used expression which just maintains the truth. Athanasius himself, in his zeal to take this passage out of the hands of the heretics, reduced its meaning too much—Quemadmodum Pater et filius sunt unum essentiâ, ita nos *aliqua similitudine et rudi formula*, dum in eum respicimus, efficimur unum, una inter nos et mutua concordia animi et Spiritus unitate. But this very Spiritus unitas points to a profounder meaning. If we are in Christ and Christ in us by the Spirit, this extends to a depth of reality in our union with God, such as St Peter points to in his second Epistle (ch. i. 4) —"partakers of the divine *nature*,"—in connection with which, however, the "that ye may *be made*" retains the true distinction as it concerns us. Bengel remarks, "Jesus does not ask that He may be one with the Father; He asks that believers may be. The former unity is by nature, the latter by grace;" but we may add "tending to that of nature," and point to the τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν, ver. 23. Augustine distinguishes still more precisely, Non ait, ut *nobiscum* sint unum, aut *simus* unum *ipsi et nos*, sicut unum sumus nos.—Finally, let it be observed that as the Lord had *never* previously united Himself with men by any *We*, in the presence of God and in relation to Him, so even in this prayer, which finally embraces His disciples all in one, and unites them most fully to Himself, He still utters no such

[1] That Christ should be one with the Father, as the deniers of His Divinity say, κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν καὶ διάθεσιν τῆς ὁμοφρονίας.

Hosted by Google

"*We*," but on the contrary places Himself with God in another *We* which is distinguished from that. And this, too, in *prayer*, which makes it still more emphatic than in ch. xiv. 23. But, again, in this unity of nature there is still the distinction ἐγὼ καὶ σύ.[1]

Ver. 12. Φυλάσσειν is manifestly more than τηρεῖν, inasmuch as it makes prominent the more specific *protection against* present danger which is included in the more general idea of *preservation*. It is true that afterwards, when no longer in the world by visible, audible, human presence, the Son Himself keeps and defends His own—see ch. x. 28–30. But there is yet a difference, so that He who is going presently to return and remain can truly say, When I was with them—as we have found and expounded this in the previous chapters. Again, this bold expression (as Cyril observed) in which the Lord makes His own and the Father's keeping one, must rest upon their equal power and dignity.[2] To the Holy Father, Keep Thou—as a Divine work; and now, I have hitherto kept! Who, leaving the world, could thus speak to God but He who is One with Him? Peter's denial, the offence and forsaking of all, were already in ver. 8 prophetically overlooked, as no real apostasy; it now comes out more strongly that the Eleven are, notwithstanding, those who are kept and not lost. But the one miserable apostate—the good Shepherd thinks of him now, and it is a drop of sorrow in the cup of His joy—now once more, and this once only, since the νῦν ἐδοξάσθη of ch. xiii. 31. Here lies the deep mystery of evil, which continues even after redeeming grace, yea, continues to strive *against* it. Did not Jesus *desire*, as much as in Him lay, to preserve and save even Judas also? Does He say—Whom I have let go, given up! or anything equivalent to that? God forbid! *On the contrary He here*

[1] On which it was scarcely for Bengel to say, "Nor is it befitting that believers in praying to the Father and the Son should say *Ye*. Which language, however, some practical divines use." The living exercise of prayer can address and invoke only the one God, whether in the Father, or in the Son, or (as the Spirit has taught the Church) in the Holy Ghost.

[2] "What our Saviour here says could be said by no man, by no angel, of himself. It was impossible to every creature, God alone could keep His own in His name.—*I have kept them in Thy name* is widely different from whatever the most faithful servant of God could do." A. H. Francke.

Hosted by Google

calls to witness what He had done for His disciples as a justification of Himself against what might have the appearance of neglect. It must be admitted that εἰ μή elsewhere sometimes stands merely for ἀλλά, without introducing any exception to what precedes; but the simple reader must yield to the conviction that the one is here excepted from the twelve. The broken number of the Apostles is referred to throughout as one—with *them*, I have kept *them*, and so, not one *of them;* and the thought and feeling of the Lord in this prayer is precisely the same as in the previous expression of His sorrow—*One of you*, ch. xiii. 21.[1] This is the one, who was chosen and yet not chosen—the former being as real as the latter. This one did *not* comply with that condition which was already described in ver. 6 as the decision of man's freedom corresponding to His grace—*the keeping the word. Therefore* he is *lost*, ἀπώλετο—which must assuredly be taken in strict connection with the δέδωκας. The Lord bears this *witness* against him, while He mourns over him before the Father, and appeals to His own fidelity—*I* have not neglected him![2] Thus this word stands in the High-priestly prayer, with all its profound, solemn, weighty significance of *warning:*—Let no man depend upon the keeping of the Father and the Son, or upon the intercession of the High Priest, as upon an *irresistible grace* which will render this *being lost* impossible.

Jesus *names* not the lost one, for several reasons: through sorrow (as in ch. xiii. 26)—because he is reprobate (Ps. xvi. 4)—but, finally, because his person is regarded as the *type* of all whom the Lord sees in the future as lost with him. This last is assumed afterwards by the Holy Ghost, 2 Thess. ii. 3, where the Antichrist who will close the series receives the condemning name of his forerunner—*son of perdition.* This construction as derived from the Hebrew בֵּן is plain enough; but it is too often forgotten that it involves as its fundamental principle the necessary attribution of personal guilt, the note of what is *a man's own*, and out of which springs his character and his fate. Thus we have בֶּן־בְּלִיַּעַל, בֶּן־עֲוִלָה, בֶּן־מָוֶת—in Isa. lvii. 4, יִלְדֵי־פֶשַׁע Sept.

[1] Glassius, incorrectly: Non excipitur ex Christo datorum numero Judas, sed iis tantum opponitur per adversativam.

[2] Nos sane Individuorum amissorum reddemus rationem. Bengel.

Hosted by Google

τέκνα ἀπωλείας, parallel with זֶרַע שֶׁקֶר[1]—Ecclus. xvi. 9, ἔθνος ἀπωλείας—in the New Testament υἱὸς γεέννης, Matt. xxiii. 15, υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας, Eph. ii. 2, but also υἱὸς εἰρήνης, Lu. x. 6, τέκνα ὑπακοῆς, 1 Pet. i. 14. Thus in the υἱὸς is involved the *unsalvability* of this lost one, and his own guilt,[2] as in 2 Thess. ii. 3, ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας precedes as the principle and reason of the perdition. Further the ἀπώλεια after the ἀπώλετο is by no means tautological—I have lost none but him who is lost!—but as in the first place the being lost included the perdition, so now the latter is made prominent by the ἀπώλεια; and, penetrating more deeply into the root of the matter, the *damnation* is viewed as one with the *sin*. Ἀπώλεια is at the same time פֶּשַׁע as in Isa. lvii. This expression paves the way for the πονηρόν, ver. 15, and regards the sin and all its consequences as one, and it is of great significance (for the right interpretation of ver. 15 afterwards) that the Lord does not descend in this prayer to mention the author of sin, the *father of perdition*,[3] but abides in the abstraction, albeit an abstraction very concrete.

Having come to that dark boundary where sin and its resulting perdition contends even against His grace, the Lord finds His solace, now as ever, in the foreseeing counsel of the Father, which, while it never could will sin, nevertheless victoriously takes it up into its purposes of grace to the saved. I have foretold thee of this—such consolation in such experience needed even the Son as man. The quotation of *Scripture* as referring to Judas[4] has the same force here as in ch. xiii. 18; but here there is a broader view of all those passages of Scripture generally which prophesy of this Judas personally, and of that which was illustrated in him—the being loved in vain and lost. The word does indeed primarily refer to specific prophecy concerning

[1] To which passage there may be direct allusion here. But not, as Lange thinks, that the Scripture here said to be fulfilled is to be found in this chapter (where the plurals gradually pass into the singular), especially vers. 12, 13. There are other and plainer *Scriptures* which point to Judas' person!

[2] Braune, therefore, contradicts the text, when he says—"He calls him *son*, and that is His love; but *lost*, that is His holiness."

[3] As Nonnus inaptly interjects εἰ μὴ δαιμονίου φθισήνορος υἱὸς ὀλέθρου.

[4] Concerning which Bahrdt said, Who can mistake the marginal gloss here?!

Hosted by Google

this *son of perdition:* we must not forget this, and think with Junius that "Jesus regarded the universal truth of the law of Moses and the Prophetical Scriptures, and their unanimous consent in this, *that not all* to whom the word of God was preached *should be saved.*" Again, what Braune says remains true, "Jesus caused it not, still less the Scripture, least of all God"—but Judas himself, although a child of Satan, is at the same time the author and father of his own sin and his own perdition, as ἀπολλύμενος and ἀπολωλώς the *son* and heir of his self-willed ruin.

Ver. 13. I come to Thee—see on ver. 11. We have already admitted that our Lord, as He here plainly says, prayed aloud in the hearing of His disciples for their instruction and comfort:—the λαλῶ[1] with ἵνα makes it here undeniable. *In the world;* that is, He *utters* this prayer now finally before His coming to the Father, pre-eminently for His own in the world.[2] And this shows, as Lücke observes, the difference between the intercession in this world and that continued *in the other.* For the Son will above speak to the Father, and before Him, otherwise than here below in the flesh: there is an antithesis which nevertheless rests upon their essential unity; for *these things* are the same which He here would begin to say, and will there continue to say. Concerning the fulfilment of Christ's joy in His disciples, see upon chap. xv. 11 and xvi. 24. Here there is a direct anticipation of this glorious end of all. "This High-priestly intercession is the object and the ground of never-failing joy." Who can, indeed, apprehend himself by faith to be included in it, without an increase of joy in the faith which *anticipates* victory and eternal glory, just as it was anticipated in this prayer uttered then in the world? Jesus did not even now think only of His first disciples:—we hear St John, 1 John i. 4, appropriating to all believers the promise of a joy which is full, and yet ever increasing; and in his private Epistle hoping that *his own* spoken words may, through the grace of his Lord, con-

[1] To which Nonnus adds very improperly a σοί: καὶ τάδε σοὶ ξύμπαντα διήϊον—All this have I said *to Thee*, O Father!

[2] What other mysteries in yet higher words, or in silence, might He have spoken of to His Father, if His aim had not been to speak all *for us*, that *we* also might know his intercessory prayer! Comp. Schmieder, S. 148.

Hosted by Google

tribute to the fulness of the disciple's joy, 2 John 12. That which the intercession of Jesus prayed and assured to His own, is made in the hands of the Spirit a blessing distributed in ever-increasing measure to all. Whosoever speaks and writes under the benediction of this discourse of Jesus increases and fulfils the *joy* of those who hear and read. And especially whosoever can *pray* after this pattern of all liturgical service and prayer!

Vers. 14–16. The *goal* of perfect *joy*, of that *peace* the principle of which through their union with Christ by faith is already given to them, and which will increase more and more, has now been expressed. But the great *danger of the way* has had a fearful exhibition in that One among the Twelve! We know already how the Lord had applied this example to the humiliation and warning of the rest. Hence the intercession now first begins with definite precision, entering more deeply and plainly into the necessity of their condition:—*Keep* them—from the *evil!* First stands the repetition of the foundation, vers. 6–8, on which His petition rests—I have, on My part, given them Thy word! Indeed, this is enough, enough for the foundation of their defence, in this *one treasure* lies *all*—that is, with the Spirit (as is more plainly expressed in ver. 17), who is regarded by anticipation as being already in the word. Nevertheless, there is connected with this *beneficium* an *incommodum inde natum* (as Lampe says)—Therefore the world hateth them! Let all that was said upon ch. xv. 19, 20 be called to mind; and especially that the hatred for the word's sake falls upon the persons, because of the difference in character of which those who hold it bear witness. The hatred of the world is the always resulting consequence, in the degree in which the word has been given to us:—hence ἐμίσησεν parallel with δέδωκα. But now comes the disclosure of the reason—*For* they are not of the world. As there was in ch. xv. 19, the emphatically repeated designation of this relation, so now we have the same before and after, in ver. 14 and ver. 16, as the reason of the petition coming between in ver. 15. *As I*—on this comparison and reason we have spoken already upon ch. xv. After the creation of the new man, which is now their proper *person*, after their union with Christ through the regeneration by the word, they are no longer of the world. He Himself, otherwise than we, was originally not of it: "Dur

Hosted by Google

ing the whole time of His being in the world, He had not been, for one moment, of the world—but had been elevated above it in kingly majesty." (Albertini.) But in the case of the disciples, the same world which hateth them hath still something of its own in their hearts. *This* is the inmost reason why they must remain in the world; they must pursue the conflict into victory.

I pray not that Thou shouldst take them (now at once, with Me) out of the world! This also He speaks, most assuredly, for the instruction of the hearers of His prayer. He thus admits that it might be reasonable to ask this: on the one hand, it must appear to the disciples a good and desirable thing, while, on the other hand, He by declining such a prayer intimates that it would be the reverse. He gives them to understand that they should yet remain a long time in the world, even after He had gone to the Father. Not, therefore, as that premature wish, ch. xiii. 37, desired; not as their somewhat clearer apprehension might now earnestly prefer, "How good for us if He would remove us with Himself" (Francke). So, also, contrary to the deep desire which all His future disciples would feel;—a desire which is not to be compared, however, with that of Elijah, oppressed by despondency (1 Kings xix. 4), nor to be regarded as the desire of lethargy and idleness, but such as the Apostle expressed in Phil. i. 23. In their first conversion and joy almost all more or less feel a desire to be at once with Him above, as Albertini's hymn sings, "I have seen Thy throne, Lord, from afar, and would fain be with Thee; gladly would I commit to Thee, Creator of Spirits, my weary life." And often we think concerning others, Well for them now to die, for then they would be safe in heaven! But the Lord knows better, and we should learn a better lesson from His words on this occasion. He asks not for this; then ask it not thyself, either for thyself or for others! Reply with the Apostle to thine own desire to depart, Nevertheless it is *better*, for it is more *needful*, to remain in the flesh and in the world. Content thyself with praying for thy *preservation*, until thou *hast* fulfilled all thy work, and *art* thyself made perfect.

And this gives us the two reasons, which pass into each other, for which it was better that they should remain. First, believers are to continue the witness and work of the Lord in

Hosted by Google

the world, like Paul they must have fruit of their labours. Luther makes this the prominent reason, "The question must not be of their going out of the world with Me; for I have much to do by their means, My kingdom to spread, and My little flock to be increased." But with this must be connected the other; only in the struggle to accomplish this are *we ourselves* perfected and *sanctified;* thus only do we bring forth fruit unto our own ripe fitness for heaven. As the same hymn of Albertini proceeds: "But I am sinful, still stooping to the earth, and this His Holy Spirit hath taught me most convincingly; I must abide in this world yet longer that I may be wholly sanctified by His Spirit, my mind must learn to enter more deeply into His, my feet must learn to stand immovably!" For a believer to accomplish his final salvation, and reach the haven without making shipwreck of faith, is no light thing, but possible only through the power of the intercession of the Mediator, and the strength of God obtained through Him. "Men wonder when a believer falls; but they should much more wonder to see him stand fast to the end, and finish his course with joy." (Hofacker.) But the great *prize,* the full fruit, of our discipline is this, to be able to say throughout the conflict and at the end—But in all these we are *more than conquerors!* Rom. viii. 37.

All this is sufficiently grounded and explained in the petition —But that Thou wouldst keep them *from the evil.* Is the *evil* masculine or neuter? Many from the earliest times have assumed the former, regarding the Lord as pointing to the great enemy from whom the disciples are to be defended; Bengel is among them, as was also Nonnus before him.[1] Wesley corrects the Eng. trans. *from the evil* into *from the evil one.* But our opinion is different, and we hold to Luther's translation. There are passages, such as 2 Thess. iii. 3, which speak of the *evil one;* but the sense and connection are not the same in them. In 1 John v. 19 (which is generally adduced as decisive), the *evil one* is not referred to, for he had been mentioned in the previous verse; there is the same connection there as here between the πονηρόν and the κόσμος, and what is meant

[1] Ἀλλ' ἵνα μιν βλεφάροισιν ἀκοιμήτοισι φύλαξῃς δαίμονος ἀρχεκάκοιο δυσαντήτων ἀπὸ θεσμῶν.

Hosted by Google

is the *evil* which that *evil one* had brought into the world, and into which he had brought the world, so that it now lies fast in it. Rosenmüller well says, It is the neuter, with allusion to the masculine which precedes. It would be a strange thing to read there—*lieth in the wicked one.* The ἐν in this passage perfectly corresponds with the ἐκ in ours; and this opposes the reference to Satan, since elsewhere we find only τηρεῖν ἀπὸ—excepting in Rev. iii. 10 where ἐκ τῆς ὥρας of temptation has the same meaning as here, something being indicated in which they are found who are to be saved out of it by preservation.

We gave our reasons in Vol. i. for not understanding *the evil one* to be mentioned in the last petition of the Lord's Prayer, referring to the important parallel, 2 Tim. iv. 17, 18; and had previously exhibited upon Matt. v. 39 the fundamental idea of πονηρόν as used by our Lord. The repugnance which we there expressed to the introduction of the conquered enemy, is strengthened when he is regarded as entering into this final prayer of victory and glorification. Luthardt may utter his protest, and declare it to be most appropriate that both in the Lord's Prayer and in this the devil should be alluded to—*de gustibus non est disputandum.* We regard it as a very important argument for our view, that the Lord is here dealing with the simply impersonal *neutral*, and general fundamental elements both of evil and good. First, we have the two designations in strict parallel, ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου—ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ. As far as the disciples are still *in the world* (ver. 11), they are also *in the evil*, but they are to be sanctified *in the truth*, ver. 17. These are all plain correlatives; and moreover we have seen that in ver. 12 the neuter *perdition* is used, the name of the author, the destroyer, being however avoided. Olshausen thinks the ἐκ, as parallel with ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, decisive against explaining it of the devil: "If the Lord had intended to bring a personality into the parallel, He would have been more pointed in designating him, for instance, by *prince of this world.*" And certainly this name was near enough at hand! So B.-Crusius thinks the ἐκ more appropriate to the neuter. Throughout the whole New Testament we have the τηρεῖν, with such a qualification, only in Jas. i. 27, besides this passage and Rev. iii. 10; there it is with ἀπό, which generally accompanies φυλάσσειν,

Hosted by Google

and ἀπό would stand here also, if Luther's simple view "*against* the evil" were quite correct. It is certain that ἐκ, in the unusual pregnant construction of this passage, has a corresponding ἐν to be supplied, which could refer only to πονηρόν.[1] Even Lampe, unlike the Reformed, prefers here and in the Lord's Prayer, the neuter.[2]

The evil is really the same comprehensive term here as there: —*sin*, the "malitia mundana" (though not with Grotius' external application, who explains ἐκ by *ab*) is the ground, as we find *evil world* in Gal. i. 4: but it *includes* all the miserable fruits and consequences of sin, from the equally *tempting* as profitable κακία of every day (Matt. vi. 34), up to the tremendous ἀπώλεια of eternity. In Joseph's word, Gen. xxxix. 9, הָרָעָה הַגְּדֹלָה is the first prelude of this sense; for even there his meaning was that to sin against God must bring upon him greater ruin and evil than his refusal to do it. Only by taking His disciples fully out of the elemental evil of sin, can Jesus make them perfectly happy; but this is not attained by the taking away of the unsanctified prematurely out of the world. The τηρεῖν ἐκ—is a pregnant construction of great significance, by which the immediately following ἁγιάζειν is prepared for. A. H. Francke says in explanation, "That Thou wouldst keep them, as they are fast in the midst of the evil; and keep them in such a manner that they may come out of the evil finally unharmed and unsullied"—but "in the midst" is too strong, the meaning is their being helped *entirely out of it:* the saving preservation is only the continuation and completion of their first deliverance, and election out of the world. "The preservation in the name of God is their preservation in that which sanctifies the disciples; their defence against the evil is their defence against that which would defile them"—says Schmieder; but it must not be forgotten that the progressive *sanctification* itself presupposes in them the unholiness which has yet to be entirely taken away.

When ver. 16 follows again upon this, the design is to obviate the error of putting too strong a construction upon the fellowship of the disciples with the *evil;* and, further, the

[1] Brückner admits that the ἐκ would be more appropriate to the neuter.

[2] Evil as well physical as moral—he says, inexactly indeed; for the latter is not the root of the former, and in the *perdition* both are one.

Hosted by Google

Master would in this teaching prayer say for all futurity—All ye for whom I pray must be right in this respect above all! Apply to yourselves this test! Similarly, we may say that what in ver. 14 is the ground of the world's hatred, is here made the reason for His prayer being heard. But the former explanation goes more deeply into the matter.

Ver. 17. The connection with what precedes, the development of this prayer from the previous, is to be sought in this important consideration:—There is still something of the *world* in them; they are still *in the evil*, as not only afflicted and tempted from without, but also from within; they are not yet altogether released from this element of the world (go back to chap. xvi. 33, and mark the deep meaning of *in the world* there). Therefore they need to be *sanctified:* first, for their own sake and in themselves; then also, as ver. 18 shows, for the sake of the world, and for their mission to it. In fact, this *sanctify them* in connection with *I sanctify Myself*, ver. 19, is the proper *centre* of the whole prayer; nor must we let that be taken away by any superficial interpretation of this word. Assuredly, ἁγιάζειν as corresponding to the O. T. קָדַשׁ and הִקְדִּישׁ, means primarily—To separate for God, to consecrate; and so far is used with reference to impersonal things in the region of rites and types, as we find it also used by our Lord, Matt. xxiii. 17, 19. But in the New-Testament fulfilment this typical phraseology discloses all its meaning; and is no longer used with lower application, except by way of transition, as in the holy *city*, the holy covenant, holy place, τὸ ἅγιον, Matt. vii. 6. Thenceforward, it is used in what we call its moral meaning, consecration to God through separation from sin. Even in 1 Cor. vii. 14, and Rom. xi. 16, it has this meaning in part. And can we suppose that here, where the Lord is speaking out of the very centre of New-Testament truth and fulfilment, a typical and external idea was all that He attached to the word? It is in vain that B.-Crusius decrees, "We *cannot* think, with Grotius, of a moral sanctification:"—nothing else can possibly satisfy the Lord's meaning. If we understand—*Separate them*, and the question arises, *from what?* the answer is at hand—*from the evil.* If we read first, in the Old-Testament sense (which indeed has its truth), *Consecrate them*, and then ask *to what?* the connection with the *fol-*

Hosted by Google

lowing verse is not enough; we must carefully observe all that precedes, and that will lead us to the full preservation and salvation from sin for the *holy* Father. It may be said (with Hammond, Semler, Kuinoel): They were to be consecrated and separated to their vocation of teaching, their mission to the world[1]—but in the mouth of Christ that very consecration can be no other than what the entire New Testament terms sanctification. A reference to ver. 19 may oblige us to admit a *priestly* consecration of those who were to be sent, as Lampe, following Theophyl. and Ammon, maintained; but, as he allows, the New-Testament priests are now sanctified *truly* and *in the truth*. The same word applies to us all; but how shall the priests of God bring for themselves or for others spiritual sacrifices excepting as sanctified from their sins? Finally, let it be weighed well that the Lord has already acknowledged much and great things in regard to His disciples—They are Thine, O Father,—no more of the world,—They are given to Me,—I am glorified in them; but He never says concerning them—They *are* already sanctified. But, after all that, would a *consecration* have been wanting, understood, that is, as a mere external separation and setting apart? If taken out of the world, if they had been given to God and to Christ, that must have already taken place? In fact, so far as they are already pure through the word given unto them (ch. xv. 3), and Christ lives in them through the commencement of their world-renouncing faith, they are already sanctified in the sense of 1 Cor. vi. 11—but that is not enough for the ἁγίασον yet in reserve, which must be explained according to 2 Cor. vii. 1; Acts xxvi. 18, xx. 32.

The great *means* of this sanctification, by which also the internal, moral meaning of the expression is established, is the *truth*, that is, the *word* of truth, just as in Acts xx. 32. Doubtless, as we have hinted before, *in the truth* here means, *primarily* and in transition, *truly*, *really*, in opposition to the prophetic type; but to go no further than this[2] is wrong, on the other

[1] And Chrysostom: "Separate them to the word and preaching." But he adds, "their own sanctification seems to be something different from that." Theophylact says plainly, "Make them holy."

[2] This is all Luther *expresses*, but its meaning is right: "May they be soundly sanctified by Thee"—referring to Eph. iv. 24 also.

Hosted by Google

hand, being inconsistent with the added *Thy* truth. Lachmann's text, indeed (and the Vulg.), omits this important σοῦ; but the omission is to be accounted for by a wish to conform this verse to ver. 19: as *transitional*, however, to the explanatory "*Thy word* is truth," it could not be wanting here. (Even if spurious it must be supplied in the thought.) Such superficialities as taking ἐν for ϧ, ergo veritati, *i.e.*, ministerio ejus, and Meyer's *in the service of the truth*, condemn themselves, when we only consider the depth of meaning which ἐν has in the New Testament and in St John, and which certainly it retains to the full in this chapter. Nor is this ἐν the *per* of Erasmus, as Lücke thinks, "by means of"—turn to ch. iv. 23 and ch. viii. 31, 32 again! The *truth*, or the revealed, communicated reality of the knowledge of God is the *element* or medium of sanctification; the *word* which contains this truth, yea, is identical with it, becomes then the *means* or medium in another sense. The truth of God is pre-eminently all that which Christ hath said, see vers. 6, 8, 14, ch. viii. 40, xviii. 37. But Christ included, too, the ancient word of God, confirming and fulfilling it; and therefore "*Thy* truth" and "*Thy* word" embrace even here every Old-Testament word also, concerning which Ps. cxix. 160 gloried—*Thy word is true from the beginning*, or—The sum, the essential substance of Thy word, is Truth! But the former interpretation of this last passage declares that even the beginning of the word of God, of Scripture, is pure revealed truth, the witness of God against all delusion and error.

But now it is obvious that "if the word of God is thus consecrated as a *sanctifying* medium," it receives this consecration as a living word, not regarded therefore as without and independent of the *Spirit*. For every word without the Spirit is a lie; but God's word to men was never from the beginning without the Spirit in it and with it (even the law was λόγια ζῶντα, Acts vii. 38). Even the believing and waiting keeping of the word which precedes the outpouring of the Spirit—who gives life to *us* as well as to the word—is not possible without a preliminary participation of the Spirit of the word. Not as a letter, but by its spirit, the Old-Testament word imperfectly sanctified all who were, and as far as they were, sanctified; on the other hand, the hold-

Hosted by Google

ing fast and perverting the letter without sincerity of heart, and without entering into the truth of the word—was turned into the most fearful lie (1 Jno. ii. 4), and crucified the incarnate Word Himself. Thus we understand how far the Lord attributes to the previous word the beginning of a sanctification, while He prays for that fulfilment of it which the Old Testament was not capable of producing:—prays anticipatingly that the Father, when the *Spirit* shall have been sent with the perfect words which the Son had spoken, would sanctify His own more and more, even unto perfection, in this full living reality of the word. Though *the Holy Ghost* is not named throughout this prayer—remarkable enough after the previous discourses!—because the Lord prays altogether in the Spirit, yet it must not be forgotten that in all the influences and energies of grace which are prayed for, from the first *giving of life* to the final *union and glorification*, nothing else is meant and prayed for but the selfsame Holy Spirit. The entire prayer prays in the Spirit for the Spirit; and in this centre of it the *truth*, which is regarded as one with the *word*, can have no other meaning than that we found in the *Spirit and truth*, of ch. iv. 23. Did not the Lord, in the great promise which preceded the prayer, expressly term the Paraclete the *Spirit of the truth!* If there in the beginning this referred especially, yea almost exclusively, to a revelation to knowledge, to true teaching, so we see now at the end that the word deepens its meaning, and that Spirit of *the* truth becomes actually a most profound and all-embracing name. The truth and reality of the self-communication of God to man, which quickens and sanctifies by means of the word offered to his knowledge, is now the Spirit (1 Jno. v. 6)—and is at the same time the glorified *word*, as lifegiving as it is living.[1] This last ὁ λόγος ὁ σός should be pondered by all who talk about the Lord's intercession for a Spirit and a truth *independent* of the canonical word which is here strictly bound up with it, as given by God through the prophets and finally by His Son.

But the prayed-for *sanctification*, although it proceeds throughout the whole life of believers, cannot be made in the fullest sense perfect before death; for death remains as the final test

[1] Which may be supplementarily added to what was already said upon ch. xiv. 17.

Hosted by Google

of faith and its perseverance, and this full consummation embraces really the reception of the inheritance—just as is signified by *among those who are sanctified* in Acts xxvi. 18, and according to the comprehensive sense of *they who are sanctified*, Heb. ii. 11. It is the Son who sanctifies us in Himself; it is the Father who sanctifieth us through the Son in the Spirit; specifically and conclusively it is thus the Spirit, as the living truth of God, who produces this sanctification. But, on the other hand, as before the defence, so now the sanctification, of believers is not without their own faith and fidelity, their *obedience to the truth*. (1 Pet. i. 15, 16, 22.) Hence the Spirit Himself exhorts, as in St John's first Epistle, "He that hath this hope in Him—*purifieth himself*," ch. iii. 3. (In this ἁγνίζειν mark, at the same time, the true meaning of ἁγιάζειν!) And in ch. v. 18, 19 of that Epistle this *sanctifieth himself* is connected with *keeping himself*, as *not sinning*, as the entire deliverance *from the evil* in which the world lieth—so that we have at the close of the companion Epistle, as it were, a specific quotation and exposition of the very words with which the Gospel here closes.

Ver. 18. Now first, after having referred to the necessity of a sanctification for the disciples themselves, in order to their being fully delivered from every ψεῦδος, the Lord directs His view to their official vocation, as strictly bound up with their personal advancement in faith. (Acts xx. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 7.) The Lord here anticipates the word which was afterwards spoken, ch. xx. 21 (which directly and fully could not be spoken to them until after the Resurrection); and in this word their calling, their appointment, their need, advance to a higher meaning. He does not merely *leave* them in the world, He *sends* them to it and into it! He appoints them not merely to keep there the word itself, to receive it fully in its truth to the sanctification of their own persons, but to carry about this word as a testimony (Acts viii. 15); to continue their testimony to the truth, as He Himself in ch. xviii. 37. But the personal and official calling are ever one in their several spheres; and most certainly so in the Apostles, as their name testifies. It is only in the world, while we live and contend in it as not of it, and keep ourselves in the word of truth, that our full sanctification is possible. As He Himself in the flesh overcame through conflict, and by true obedience sowed the

Hosted by Google

seed which was now to produce the full harvest of His glory—so also is it with us. He here condescends to equality with us, in respect to His mission in His humanity; afterwards in ver. 19 His own specific *I sanctify Myself* follows, in which we must recognise the great distinction which subsists in this equality. *To bear fruit* in ourselves and also in others, is but one and the same; even as He, while He was Himself perfected, at the same time perfected all. (Heb. v. 9; x. 14.) This we have already seen in the parable of the vine.[1] Assuredly, this mission to the world applies, according to his ability, to the most private individual, who goes most quietly through life, working out his own salvation—for how can any one be a light in the world without diffusing his light; how can he have the graces of Christ without making them known; how can he be sanctified in the truth, without bearing witness for the truth? Again, who can be sanctified without the discipline of this conflict with the unholy world? Thus we have here the strongest reason why He will not take His own out of the world; why we should not wish to forsake the society of men, and be at rest before the time; why we should rather persevere in our mission, *as He did!* (1 Jno. iv. 17.) The distinction in this similarity between Him and us is already denoted in this, that now the *Son* sendeth His own, even as the Father had sent Him. Thus through us, as the Father's *subdelegates*, so to speak, the work upon earth proceeds, so far as it has yet to be accomplished.—Nevertheless, with all this co-reference of the word to *future* disciples, the Lord's view rests in ver. 18 upon these first, specific *Apostles;*[2] on which account in ver. 20 its express extension is resumed—*Not for these* only.

Ver. 19. But before this there is one solitary, but all-comprehensive word in the middle of the prayer—the High-priestly ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν which lays the *foundation* for the περὶ αὐτῶν, as a conclusive testimony to His *redeeming work*, His *redeeming death*. Let us now seek rightly to understand this *I sanctify Myself!*

[1] Compare Rothe's Ethik. iii. 57.

[2] Luther: He hereby appoints His *Apostles* to be doctors and preachers, and binds us all to their words, whether we be learned or unlearned; so that, however wise we may be, we must humble ourselves to let these poor fishermen teach us and guide us, hearing them as we would Christ Himself.

Hosted by Google

According to ch. x. 36 the Father had already *sanctified* Him, in sending Him into the world; from His birth He had been the Holy One of God in the unholy world. This *I sanctify Myself* in the *present* tense cannot, therefore, refer generally to His vocation and mission generally, to His whole life of teaching and action.[1] A sanctification from sin He needed not like us! Luther says to the simple, or to the perverse, "Thou must not understand this word as if He was to become holy in a sense in which He was not so before; for He was holy in His mother's womb, Lu. i. 35." This is sufficiently obvious; but how is the same word used of Him, which had just been used of us? It is plain at the outset, that He in a certain sense condescends to fellowship with them; and we must, first of all, and before a deeper meaning is established, content ourselves with Grotius' explanation—He repeats the word *sanctify* in a sense somewhat changed.

But what is that sense? Here recurs the same fundamental idea of the קָדַשׁ and הִקְדִּישׁ derived from the O. T., and which we showed to be the first meaning of the word; that meaning is now brought to its full fulfilment in the sanctification of the *Priest* and the *sacrifice*, the ἐμαυτόν showing that Christ is both in one. I consecrate, devote Myself as the Lamb of God to sacred, sacrificial service:—such is the main meaning, as the Apostles might and must have understood it. Chrys., I bring before Thee an offering. Euthym., I voluntarily sacrifice Myself. And thus have most orthodox expositors understood it down to our own day; and rightly so, for consecration to God, and offering to God, is really the common fundamental idea in

[1] As Lücke rightly remarks, against the Socinians and Rationalists—He had not in this sense sanctified and sent Himself, but the Father had sanctified and sent Him. Thus the interpretation is false, which Heumann, Semler, Kuinoel, and De Wette advocate—"I have consecrated Myself to Thee, to Thy ministry; I have undertaken for their sake the office of Thy ambassador." Semler's "I have altogether devoted and consecrated Myself in their place and for their sake," may bear a good meaning, though he is wrong in making that all. Hezel has given a lamentable interpretation: "For their sake I have exhibited Myself in extraordinary ways, by a life of virtue and the greatest miracles, by the strange vicissitudes of My lot:—for their sake, that they may know My doctrine to be Divine, worthy of their acceptation, and of the many sacrifices in which it may involve them."

Hosted by Google

vers. 17 and 19. But this by no means exhausts the reason of the use of the same word in both cases. Olshausen says too much: "But the respective position of Christ and His disciples requires us to assume that ἁγιάζειν as used concerning *Him* means *only* to 'consecrate;' while as used of the disciples it must have the subordinate idea of a preparatory sanctification of nature." For *making holy* is the essential, irremovable idea of ἁγιάζειν, it is not a subordinate idea which may be removed from it; the connection between *His* ἁγιάζειν and *ours* is once more brought most impressively forward in this same verse, in the too-often-overlooked but most emphatic ἵνα καὶ αὐτοί—. Consequently, there must be even in Him *something corresponding* to our purification and deliverance from sin; something which is the fundamental, essential *ground* of the latter. The common theory of atonement, which does not penetrate into the living oneness of the true humanity of Christ with the fallen children of Adam, will never be able to understand this memorable saying; for it leaves Jesus apart in His holiness, just where He nevertheless, descending to and penetrating our humanity, *sanctifies* Himself for us;—with all its words about the mediation and substitution of Christ, it has no true notion of His actually taking our place. Christ's standing in our stead necessarily involves this, that the doing away and overcoming of sin must be the fundamental idea even in His own ἁγιάζειν. Does He only so bear and atone for the sin of the world, does He only so perfect the purging of our sins (Heb. i. 3), that the ἁμαρτία by imputation alone (then an impossible thing!) lies only *upon* Him? Is it not rather, according to all Scripture, *in* His flesh, the same flesh of sin in the ὁμοίωμα of which He was sent and was born; so that in *this* flesh, this human nature and human person of the *incarnate* Son, *sin* was condemned and done away? (Rom. viii. 3.) Hence Schmieder says unhesitatingly: "The self-sanctification of Jesus was, in this relation, subjected to the same conditions under which the sanctification of His disciples stands; it was necessary that He should offer up the human in Him as that which was contrary to God." This points us to the truth of that which is generally known as Menken's theory —to the truth which, rightly understood, is found in connection with much that is false. The author's theory (which must not

Hosted by Google

be confounded with Menken's !) is in some degree known, and cannot here be fully unfolded anew.[1] Thus much is certain, that we must, if we would do justice to this word, Jno. xvii. 19, admit, whether we understand it or not, a certain *sanctification*, renovation, or restoration of human nature *even in the very person of Christ*, as the root or germ of *our* sanctification :—by means of which He Himself was released from a certain *real connection with our sin*, and thus became the First-born of all the brethren sanctified in and through Himself. Rothe (in his Ethik ii. 307) approaches the truth of the matter, when he connects with the atonement for our sin by the "second Adam" the personal and perfected sanctification of the Redeemer Himself[2]—who thus through His absolute unity on the one side with God, and on the other side with mankind, becomes the sufficient principle or cause of sanctification to the sinful world of humanity. (Thus Rothe expounds, too, our present verse.) We must, however, protest against the strange, unscriptural notion which he blends with it as it regards the connection of the Holy Ghost with the true body of Christ; and, further, must add that He by means of His *flesh* bore *in and upon Himself* the power of sin which was to be overcome, the power of sin in humanity as fallen in Adam, a member of which humanity He must become in order to be its Head. Not indeed as positive, actual *sin*, but still in a real connection with that resisting power in it which gives occasion to the *warfare* and the *suffering* issuing in the victory of obedience. True, indeed, it is that He had never prayed to the Father, and does not now so pray—*Sanctify Thou Me!* but He could, and it was needful that He should, simply as the Holy One in the Spirit, from the beginning sanctify *Himself in the flesh*.[3] This self-sanctification, however, reached its proper perfection first in the *sufferings of death* (so that these are spoken of as His *being*

[1] I refer particularly, in connection with the Essay in the Andeutungen ii. S. 24, to my exposition of the Hebrews, where my first views have received much extension and modification. Lange also, rightly understood, will be found to be in accordance with them.

[2] Which Petersen (von der Kirche, i. 337) calls the discipline or asceticism of Christ, perfected in solitude.

[3] See the extract from Athanasius in Dorner S. 951, and Lampe also, who says almost the same.

Hosted by Google

perfected)—that passion of death in which the willing spirit subdues the weak flesh in sharp conflict of the soul coming between them, constraining it to the great offering and merit of an *obedience* which was *learned* and persevered in, Heb. v. 7, 8, x. 9, 10, 14. The Pres. ἁγιάζω speaks of this impending sacrifice in death as of such a sanctification, analogous with our own; the ὑπέρ in addition points back manifestly to the last *Supper*. (2 Cor. v. 15; Tit. ii. 14.) Thus only out of the death of Christ comes our new life, for the ὁμοίωμα of His death becomes efficient in us as our actual "dying to sin"—Rom. vi. 3–11;[1] 1 Pet. ii. 24. Thus we see the great truth of the words—*I sanctify Myself in order that they may be sanctified;* and it is only through this *in order to* that we reach our sanctification. I sanctify Myself for them—is not merely *more* than, I pray for them! That alone is the ground and strength of His intercession, which is here placed upon its true foundation for a testimony before us and before the Father. Before the Father—*Lo I come*, let My offering be well-pleasing to Thee! Thus was it prophetically and comprehensively said, when He came into the world (Heb. x. 5)—but now, when He is leaving the world and coming to the Father with the merit of His obedience, the blood of His sacrifice, the purging of our sins obtained by Himself, it becomes a full and decisive *truth*.

In proportion as *sin* becomes to us, through the fellowship of His holy and willing Spirit, a *bitterness*, we also are sanctified *in the truth*, essentially *in truth*. This is assuredly, *first*, and without the article still more evidently, ἀληθῶς, truly[2]—that is not, however, sufficient, but the word looks back to ver. 17. The *truth* of God is the objective element and goal of actual, essential sanctification. Still less does it suffice to understand this of the *sincere faith* with which we *on our part* lay hold of and appropriate the sacrifice of our Lord—this subjective

[1] If the death of *our sin* did not lie essentially and energetically in His death, how could it proceed therefrom as stated here, and elsewhere in the apostolical teaching?

[2] Mich. Weber: vere, *i.e.*, non typice, non symbolice. Bengel: In truth, although it may not externally appear. This is opposed to ceremonial holiness.

Hosted by Google

condition is only silently presupposed. Luther exhibits here a want of doctrinal clearness, arising from his anxiety to deduce everything connected with justification from faith "alone;" he speaks, indeed, properly enough of the fruits and works of faith, but he is lacking upon the scriptural *teaching* concerning *sanctification*.[1] He tells us on this passage, that we must preach here about nothing but *Christ's* sanctification (although Christ preaches of *ours!*)—"that we must simply hang on His word, and creep into Christ's sanctification." He most incorrectly imposes this meaning upon our passage, and goes on, "*therefore* it was that He so diligently repeated the words *in truth*, laying that down in opposition to all the world, and all human holiness. *My sanctification*, He saith, *maketh them truly holy*." True, but would this *reckoning ourselves* (Rom. vi. 11) in apprehending faith *be* a truth, a true *sanctification*, if believers did not furthermore make that their end and object, which Rom. vi. 12–22 goes on in such amplitude to set forth? In 1 Cor. i. 30 there is a distinction between δικαιοσύνη and ἁγιασμός, which must be carefully noted; but the Lord speaks distinctively of the *latter*, of the great design to be perfectly accomplished in and by the justified. Euthymius is right in referring it to the idea of sacrifice—"in order that they also may be sacrificed in a true offering"—but this must be understood in the sense of Rom. xii. 1, 2; Eph. v. 1, 2. *Sanctified* are we first in the perfection of our obedience, likewise, when nothing but the holy will of Divine love dwells and lives in us, just as in Christ. Not forgiveness of sins and justification, which is only the ground and beginning, but sanctification unto entire unblamableness of our nature, is the goal, the end contemplated in the redeeming death of our Lord, Eph. i. 4, v. 25–27; Col. i. 22. But this design may be rendered abortive, even in the case of the justified, through *their* unfaithfulness; hence the urgent exhortations of the Paraclete in the word and in our hearts, and the intercessions

[1] I may assure Münchmeyer, who naturally enough takes offence at this, that I also with Luther understand sanctification to be no other than the fruit of faith; but I cannot find in Luther a sufficiently full development of all that the Scripture says concerning our own diligence and zeal, and their fruit and reward.

Hosted by Google

of the Paraclete above. Lampe maintains, according to the hard abstract logic of his theory of predestination, that "it follows from this connection that no sanctification is to be expected but through the merit of the sacrifice of Christ; and Jesus would lose the fruit of His death if any one, for whom He died, should not actually be sanctified; there is a *necessary* bond of connection between the death of Christ and the sanctification of the elect, which the Lord's train of thought takes for granted;"—but all this shows that he did not rightly read the ἵνα, for the sense of which we point to Jno. i. 7, iii. 17, and even Rom. xi. 32. As if the branches had not been spoken of which abide not in Him, and, just before, a Judas given to Him, watched over, and yet lost! As if the Scripture, Rom. xiv. 15; 2 Pet. ii. 11, and elsewhere, did not testify literally concerning the lost for whom nevertheless Christ died, and whom He had bought![1] Consequently, Christ merely sanctifies Himself for all, *to the end that* all may be capable of sanctification. It is true that He now prays only for His own, whose faith and perseverance He contemplates in anticipation; but while His thought here penetrates into the depth of this *fundamental work* of salvation, He is impelled to enlarge the range of His intercession, as widely as the testimony itself in ver. 21—*That* the world may believe.

Thus we have now the widest comprehension *of all future believers*, brought to faith by the continued mediation of the word, down to the end. Not only so, we have at the same time the *prosecution* of the previous intercession up to its ultimate end in glory. The glorious conclusion of the prayer, as it stretches forward into eternity, can only in eternity be fully understood. As, to the Lord Himself, His closely impending sufferings were merged in His *glorification*, so now—

[1] It is quite consistent with this quotation, that, defending the doctrine of final perseverance against the Lutherans, Lampe appends to ver. 15 the strange and melancholy restriction, that the Lord did not pray against their foreseen, permitted, and thus *appointed* sin—but only against their *peccata graviora!* Such a system is in practice altogether untenable, misapprehends St John's *that ye sin not*, and takes away all force from the law, *Sin not!* Compare what Thiersch (Kathol. u. Protest. ii. Aufl. ii. 141 ff.) says upon these dangerous extravagances of Reformed teaching.

Hosted by Google

after the intimations of vers. 14–19, in which *their* sufferings and struggles appear as their sanctification—He says nothing more of their *afflictions in the world*, of their entering through much tribulation the kingdom of God. After ver. 17 it only remained to pray for the *glorification* of His own in Him, the consummation and manifestation of that which was spoken of in ver. 10; but He takes as the way to this (what was hinted at in ver. 11) their *being united in one*, from which their glorification, not properly to be first prayed for, follows as His own and His Father's will. Hence we may say that He first *prays for* the *unity* of all who should believe in Him and the Father (vers. 20, 21), and then He immediately *gives*, *promises*, *appoints* the *glory* of these thus united in one (that glory being in vers. 22, 23, regarded as already internally present in them, and as beaming forth upon the world in their unity, while in ver. 24 it is regarded as to be revealed in the future); thus passing altogether from praying (now become a θέλω, *I will*) into the final *promise* of vers. 25, 26, which, again, connects itself with the present of these first disciples, excluding once more the unbelieving world.

Ver. 20. *All these things* is obviously to be supplied after the *I pray;* so that the extension of His view to His future disciples appropriates to them also all that He had just said, as on the other hand the continuation of His prayer refers also to His first disciples. *Through their word* ascribes to all future disciples the same basis for our Lord's intercession which in vers. 6–8 had been assigned as the reason of His intercession for the Apostles; and in ver. 21 the first disciples themselves are again merged in the *all*. Could there be a permanent and essential distinction among those who *believe in Him* unto holiness and salvation?—It is to make *this* prominent,—the equal validity of His prayer for all,—and not merely as bringing the future into the present, that the πιστευόντων is used;—for the πιστευσόντων of the Text. Rec. appears to be an unsupported correction.[1] As in Matt. xxviii. 20 and Mark xvi. 17 all that was commanded and forbidden to the Apostles is imposed at the

[1] Two isolated Codd. read πεπιστευκότων, which is error again—for the disciples of that time are not referred to, as distinguished from the Apostles.

Hosted by Google

close upon all future believers, so is it here with all things that are prayed for. That which was intimated by their being *sent* into the world, ver. 18, is now expressly stated—that *many* disciples would from age to age be won from the *world*. And these many are presently referred to with the strongest emphasis as *all!* And who can at any time reckon up their number, the multitudes of those who are concealed from the world and their fellow-disciples, and all down to the last whom faith shall save? In this intercessory prayer, the beginning and pledge of that intercession which still prevails on high, every one who believeth has his place. "If He thought of us when we were among the people who were yet to be formed for Him, how can He forget us now, when He sees us in the midst of the world, and beholds the struggle of our faith?" (Rieger.) If the first heirs of faith are sympathising *witnesses*—surely He, the Author and Finisher of the faith, to whom we look, looks down upon us as more than a mere witness. (Heb. xii. 1, 2.)

Faith itself is not prayed for or given; here as in ver. 8 it is the *condition* of the validity and effect of the intercession. The preachers who in their well-meaning zeal lay so much stress upon the grace of calling, election, and perseverance, should ponder well the language of Scripture itself, and beware of placing too absolutely in the hand, and gift, and purpose of God, the first decision also by which man becomes a believer![1]

[1] A. H. Francke, whose challenge of faith, and exhortation to it, is so good, yet says, "Thus did He pray to the Father for that faith which I now have!" Again, "I have to thank that same prayer that I have received His word, that I can now quicken and strengthen my faith through His word!" This is wrong even as it regards believers in *distinction* from the world; for a petition concerning *believing* occurs only in ver. 21, with a ἵνα for the whole world, which *might* believe if they would. The Apostle says in 2 Tim. iv. 7, not—The Lord gave me faith: comp. 1 Tim. i. 16. χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ is not πίστις, but ζωὴ αἰώνιος, the σωτηρία—and that παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. Thus my position is incontrovertible, however much offence it may give, that faith itself, that is, our own decisive acceptance of the Divine influence and gift, is not in its subjective principle to be prayed for and given, but is demanded of us. Lange asks how this may be reconciled with Mark ix. 24; Lu. xvii. 5; and the answer is obvious. The former passage exhibits the πιστεύω of the man, elsewhere found wanting by our Lord, as a willingness on his own part: and in the other passage the Lord answers the πρόσθες of the Apostles by only εἰ εἴχετε.

Hosted by Google

All faith in all ages comes *through the word.* This, on the one hand, maintains the doctrine of prevenient grace, the grace of Him who calls, as universal for the world and as special for the individual, without which faith could not be spoken of at all: while, on the other hand, it recognises the freedom of our own decision, for *through the word* "means the free way of light and conviction." (As Braune well remarks, holding the right mean.) See Jno. xx. 31; Acts ii. 40, 41; Rom. x. 16, 17, and the entire Scripture. The word of the Father and of the Son before, is now *their* word:—the *αὐτῶν* depends immediately on the *τούτων*, and as in ver. 18 declares the Apostles to be the first medium of the *word of God* for all futurity, giving at the same time the reason why the Lord prayed specifically first for them, and in *their persons for all.* No man in after times should ever believe in Christ without the mediation of the testimony of these first witnesses; even Paul, to whom the Lord Himself appeared, was in secret prepared for his obedience to the heavenly vision, and was strengthened in his faith by the apostolical church which was in Christ before him. Nevertheless, true as this is —and too much emphasis cannot be laid upon it, against those who despise the apostolical doctrine under pretext of going straight back to the Lord Himself—it is also promised to *every* believer that others *through his word* should be brought to faith. "Thus the instrumental agencies, by which salvation is carried on, are sanctified. The word *tradition* is a good word in itself, when not perverted." (Berlenb. Bibel.)

Ver. 21. In the former passage the *first* unity of all, the future as well as the present disciples, was expressed as their equal *faith*, the sole distinguishing condition. It is this *unity* which must in its increase approve itself, and become a mighty *testimony* for believers who are to be won continually from the world. The *threefold ἵνα* exhibits a *development* in their connection:—even the second brings by *in us* the deeper consequence and fruit from the first unity in the received word, while the third plainly points to the end and fruit still contemplated. Four years before Lampe wrote, Vocula enim *ἵνα* non tam *argumentum* quam *scopum* precum indigitat, Francke had preached in Halle, "If it indicated the further *matter* of His prayer, it would have run thus: I pray—also for those—*that*

Hosted by Google

Thou wouldst give them, that they all may be one. But He is expressing the final object which He had in view in thus praying for His Apostles still—that He might bring all His own together in one." He then supplements His words thus: "But this does not exclude our regarding this as also the subject of our Lord's prayer. We may safely put the two together—both the *scopus precum* and the *argumentum precum*." With regard, however, to the third ἵνα, Lampe's "*not so much—as*" is of great importance; for in regard to the whole *world*, it is only the *design*, the aim that all who believe not might believe, which the ἵνα expresses.

What diversities are found among the members of the great body the church, in external relation to the world, as well as in vocation gifts, knowledge—and yet *all* are *one!* These two words most significantly meet here. This casts down the wall of partition between *Israel* (in this Prayer having no longer a distinctive place) and the Gentiles (Jno. xi. 52); as also all such distinctions as the ancient world recognised, according to Gal. iii. 28; Rom. i. 14. Similarly, by anticipation, all the distinctions which the modern world, and, alas, the Christian world itself, has set up. Here is the inmost principle of the *union* which seeks to find its external expression. The faith of the lowest and least is an *equally precious* faith with that of the Apostles, with that of Peter (2 Pet. i. 1)—there is a κοινωνία τῆς πίστεως, Phil. 6. The heartfelt faith of one who is theologically unformed and untaught, who knows nothing of dogmatic theology, must be recognised in its validity as ἰσότιμος by the most orthodox guides of faith. Distinctions and gradations there are, but unity may be secured and even illustrated in these. An enforced, external, deceptive unity is far from being the thing spoken of here; but the one word on which faith rests, the one end of the one way in the imitation of the one Lord and Shepherd, the one Spirit by whom all have access to one Father, make the essential unity of all who believe, and according to the proportion of their faith, know and live in believing. Not only among those who live near each other, and know themselves and their unity; but also among those who are distant from each other and unknown to each other, in all countries and through all times. The first fulfilment is found

Hosted by Google

in Acts iv. 32, as the prototype expression of the great *end*. For, as this ἵνα itself indicates, and the τετελειωμένοι in ver. 23, yet more strongly, "the unity is then first consummate when the sanctification becomes complete." (As Fikenscher excellently says, in words of comfort as well as exhortation.) First, always the *one heart and one soul*—then, on this foundation, and flowing from this, the exhortation to *speak the same thing, in the same mind and the same judgment* (1 Cor. i. 10), the growing up in the unity of love *into* the *unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God*, Eph. iv. 13. Oh that our ecclesiastical bodies would hear and understand this!

"In their glasses men are brethren—when those are empty the union breaks up." (Braune.) This holds good of the intoxicating cup of vanity and delusion, over which men imagine a brotherhood of mankind independent of Christ—Pantheism, Communism, and the like. But where those *believers in Me* are, of whom Christ speaks, there *is* already unity, on the ground of which a further and more perfect unity *will* follow. This deepening advancement in the meaning is expressed by the *in us*,[1] introduced through the mediating clause *as Thou*, etc. Such interpretations as that of Grotius, *Sicut* nos conjunctis operis evangelium promovemus, and afterwards, ἐν ἡμῖν, *i.e.*, nobis obediendo! we will leave to the acceptance of the friends of false light. "The *being one* of believers is not only a being one after the *similitude* of the Father and the Son, but it is *bound up with* their being one; it is at the same time a being one *with* Father and Son, *since* God through Christ and His Spirit *essentially dwells in them*.[2] 1 Jno. i. 3." The *in us*, not merely *with us*, is now a deepening of the *as we*, ver. 11, and is to be understood according to Col. iii. 3. But not again (to quote Glassius), pro eâ, quam somniant Weigeliani et Stiefeliani, credentium ἀποθεώσει καὶ χριστουσίᾳ; or in the

[1] The ἐν once more added, though sometimes wanting in the MSS., is essential. The καὶ αὐτοί refers to the καθῶς, as Lücke remarks. But the second ἵνα is not, on that account, a mere resumption of the former.

[2] So Meyer, Bl. für höh. W. vii. 161. The Restitution consequently brings us abundantly more than man's original prerogative at the creation; although Mallet said well in his sermon, "Who can hear this petition from the heart and voice of Jesus—that they may be one, as we are—without thinking of the word, Let us make man, an image of Ourselves."

Hosted by Google

sense of the Pantheist all-God and humanity-Christ of our modern dreamers. "The infinite remains infinite; and the finite is still finite, even though it be *united* with the infinite nature of God"—this position of A. H. Francke we are taught by the *word*, from which the unity of faith proceeds, to apprehend; and our *adoration* in the blessedness of glory will one day seal to us its truth. But the word alone, which we receive, does not accomplish this; that does not in itself effect that union which here begins and there will be consummated, but the power and the Spirit of God in the word.

The third ἵνα must not be immediately connected with the ἐρωτῶ;[1] but the *world* is, nevertheless, in some sense the object of intercession—that they may *believe;* so that Wesley may say concisely, "Here Christ prays for the world!" He, however, proceeds with less exactness: "Observe the sum of His whole prayer, 1. Receive Me into Thy own and My glory; 2. Let My Apostles share therein; 3. And *all other believers;* 4. *And let all the world believe!*" For, as we have seen, we cannot suppose our Lord to pray directly (and with such a general "Let" as so often occurs in our prayers) for the faith of His disciples; any such *I pray that they may believe*, is, strictly speaking, quite inappropriate to our Lord's thought and the teaching of Scripture—if we take the ἵνα as the matter and argument of the prayer. Yet Wesley is perfectly right in the placing "the world" so strikingly after and over and above "all believers." But in this there seems to be a self-contradiction, which has not been much noticed, but which guides us to the solution of the mystery; for *if* in the previous πιστεύοντες all who were to believe are already included, there can remain only the permanently unbelieving world, according to the ordinary phrase. Thus it is not as Lampe says: "First, the Apostles; then the first Christians, the first-fruits of their word, the Apostolical Church; then the residue of the company to be brought from the Jews and Gentiles into the Church, down to the end of time." For these *saved out of the world* (as Came-

[1] This would mean, I pray for them, that *they all* may be one in faith—yea, that *this whole* world may believe. But against this view, that *all who were to be one* and *the world believing* are the *same subject*, Lampe justly protests.

Hosted by Google

rarius explains *the world* here) were already included under the *all* of the second ἵνα, but there is still remaining, over and above, the world, ver. 25. Still less admissible is Calvin's view (which even Lampe opposes): "*that the world may believe* in the third clause refers only to historical faith." For the Lord could not thus reduce the meaning of this great word, so sacred throughout the prayer; He never gives this meaning to *believing;* and certainly the miserable deception of an *unsaving historical faith* could not stand here as the object of Christ's desire. And is then "that the world *may know*" ver. 23 to be interpreted (as it has been) of an enforced acknowledgment, which is only the ground of condemnation? Oh no, the Lord could not thus either speak or pray; and in the apparent parallel, Rev. iii. 9 (according to Isa. xlv. 14, xlix. 23) they are a remnant, saved out of Satan's synagogue, who are to come and worship and see the love of the Lord to His Church. Nor is what Rieger says enough: "The world is regarded under the most favourable light, as the region out of which the future believers are received and collected into one." The petition would then be—I pray for all who shall believe on Me, that they may be one, *in order that*—those thus won from the world might believe! The bare repetition of *believing*, and of *world*, instead of *those who should be saved out of the world*, cannot possibly be received. Nothing therefore remains but the comparison with *that the world might be saved*, chap. iii. 17, and *that all might believe*, chap. i. 7. The intercession reaches its limit, where it recoils from unbelief and can find no fulfilment; for while we do find *was believed on in the world* (1 Tim. iii. 16), we never find *the world hath believed.* And this, nevertheless, is the simple meaning of the word; the Lord testifies now at the end *His own* desire and will that all the world might believe!

Still more: He suggests this aim of universal, all-seeking grace to *His Church;* and would teach His people to regard this as the goal, however unattainable in itself, of all the efforts of their united love—ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύσῃ. As St Paul, Rom. xi. 13, 14, contemplates a certain number gained from his own hardened Israel, as the last and most blessed fruit of his whole mission to the Gentiles—so should the entire believing Church never cease, when regarding the unbelieving world in its op-

Hosted by Google

position, to imitate the Apostle's spirit—*If by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my flesh, and might save some of them.* And this is perfectly appropriate *to us*, since we draw no distinction between *some of them* and *the world: this* is what the Lord teaches us in the prayer which He permits us to listen to, wherein He includes in His petition even that which will not be fulfilled, just according to the *will* of the Divine counsel that all men might be saved, though all men are not. Thus "the Church should become an external Church" (as v. Gerlach says), that is, should exhibit the unity of its faith and of its love *before the world* and *for the world*, as an attracting and urgent witness; it should never cease, even in the strictest confederation of its living unity, to send forth the light and power of a universal mission, through that externality[1] of aim which is only the revelation of its internal truth and glory. That *unity* which alone gives power to its *missions*, and those *missions* which rest solely upon *unity*, are in their union the end of the Church. And this is also an intimation from above, that the greatest obstacle to the world's believing is the want of manifest unity in faith and love on the part of the imperfect Church. What condemnation, what admonition in these words of our Lord! Alas, alas, unbelief still hardens itself against the clearest testimony, ridicules the wonderful unity of love, and puts still its blasphemous construction upon the glory of Christ, beaming forth from His disciples; we however should not share its guilt, but always remember that our Lord Himself has put a strict connection between *that the world may believe* and our *being one.*

Vers. 22, 23. This might seem to be in part a repetition, but it is not so: for the unity now appears as the *glory* already given, and even already shining before the world; the establishment of this unity is placed forward as the end of perfection which we must reach to; and, finally, there is here a *knowledge* predicated of the world, corresponding to their *believing* before. *Καὶ ἐγώ*, standing at the beginning, depends on the previous *that thou hast sent Me:*—for the Saviour living in the Church, was to be contemplated in it as the Saviour of all men,

[1] Not, indeed, externalisation—see Petersen von der Kirche i. 85.

Hosted by Google

and especially of these only because they believed. Thus the καὶ ἐγώ is an explanatory *etenim*. And even because vers. 22, 23 are parallel with ver. 21, and an immediate development of it, those many tame interpretations of δόξα which have been devised are proved to be wholly out of the question.[1] Chrys. and Theophyl. took a step in advance; for they added to the working of miracles, and the wonderful teaching, the unity of love also, and the greater δόξα τῆς ὁμονοίας, thus embracing the whole furnishing of the Apostles. But, as the Apostles are no longer especially spoken of here, we regard the miraculous endowments and gifts of teaching as not taken into the account at all;—the *being one* is itself and alone the *glory*. This is already *given*, that is, not merely appointed to them,[2] not merely reserved and laid up (as the crown, 2 Tim. iv. 8), but as actually in its principle one and the same with that glory which was to be beheld in the future, and then fully enjoyed, ver. 24. That following verse is not to be distinguished from these, as containing a contrast; for throughout this prayer the Lord uses great words and ideas, fundamentally the same in meaning throughout; there is no more a twofold *glory* than a twofold *believing*. But their developments and aspects are different. Here, the *glory which Thou hast given Me* is that same glory of grace and truth, of love, of unity with the Father, which, according to Jno. i. 14, beamed forth to faith *from the humanity of Jesus;* and *this* He had truly given to His disciples upon earth already, because and so far as *He is in them*. Just as this δόξα of our Lord, *given* to His humanity, was distinguished in ver. 5, from that which He *had* eternally in the Godhead, but yet this distinction appeared only when it was to be abolished, and all is merged into one δόξα—even so must the unity and the distinction be understood here. Even the slightest glimmering of heavenly light which begins to shine out of the countenance of a justified publican, is an outbeaming of his future glorification; and so is the still brighter angel-face of the crowned martyr at his trial. Those who are risen again

[1] Grotius (like Ammonius and Zuinglius): The power of working miracles! For which he compares ch. ii. 11 and ch. xi. 40.

[2] B.-Crusius, incorrectly: "To give is here decidedly no other than to appoint." Gabler makes it at once "to promise."

Hosted by Google

with Christ in faith *are* already sitting with Him ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. (Eph. ii. 6.) Those whom God hath justified He hath already glorified. (Rom. viii. 30.) Bengel's well-meant note is insufficient "already, *albeit hiddenly*," for the subject here is the *outbeaming* of this inwardly commencing, and already present glory, before the eyes of the world (however wilfully shut). And the Preacher has here a practical exposition of our Lord's word, which he should use without ceasing—Regard each other, at least, O believers, with respect! Learn, ye children of God, to stand in awe of your own dignity, that ye defile not yourselves with sin! Let your *thanksgivings* for what hath been already given invigorate your prayer and effort after holiness and perfection! (Col. i. 12; Eph. i. 18.)

And all this *through faith!* "A drop of faith is far more noble than a whole sea of mere science, though it be the historical science of the Divine word." (Francke.) "Every Christian must thus deeply sink himself into Christ by believing—this is everything. This decides his faith, this decides his works, his life, his graces. All this is in the words—*I in them and Thou in Me!*" (Gossner.) Again, as Rieger says of this heavenly ladder, standing upon earth but reaching to the throne of God, "We must not begin at the top, but look well that we seize rightly the first steps." First in the faith of the heart to love Jesus; in the Holy Ghost, under whose discipline we stand obedient, to be one with the whole living church; and of the unity of *knowledge*, and of its *expression* in symbol and dogma, it may then be said—"It will follow!" That is, always taking it for granted that the first unity of faith in *the word of truth* is present. For, where the foundation of Christ's prayer, ver. 6–8, is not laid, there can be no love, no unity, no glory resulting, but *odium hæreticorum*, schism between Zion here and Zion there, the old envy between Ephraim and Judah, stumbling-blocks and scorn. All through faith—thus, still further back, all *through the word*, in which we believe! *This*, indeed, being the honest acknowledgment of its authority, but nothing beside being the visible centre of the unity of the church.

Vers. 22, 23 contain the same threefold ἵνα which is found in ver. 21, in the same relation and progression; hence the *and* before the third of them may well be struck out. But it is here

Hosted by Google

more clearly developed and prominent, that the union with the Father and the Son, and thereby with one another, which had been given from the early beginning of faith as a *glory*—is, nevertheless, a glory which unfolds, progresses, and increases. This is plainly contained in *that they may be perfected into one*, the εἰς being as important as the τελειοῦσθαι; comp. 1 Jno. iv. 18. Concerning the individual it is *made perfect in love*, but here *made perfect into one through love*.

Our exposition of ver. 21 will have shown that these words cannot refer to an effectual knowledge of the love of God in Christ, to which the world is brought—even though it should be at the end of the Gospel kingdom, when the company of believers shall shine forth before the world holy and glorious. Otherwise it might follow that it would be necessary only to show the New Jerusalem at last to the damned, in order to attract them to the then acknowledged eternal love of God. We reject at once all those explanations of the relations of *believing and knowing*, which assume the *world* to be those to be saved out of the world.[1] It is, assuredly, the Lord's purpose to say, with additional emphasis, that the *world* (if as world it would and subjectively could) might not merely believe, convinced by the lustre of grace which does now and which will at last most fully, shine forth in the Church —but actually *altogether* like the believers (vers. 7, 8) *intelligently and experimentally* believe.[2] The revelation of *love* leads to *know-*

[1] Among them is Bengel, who says with his usual penetration: "With the *world* the first principles of *faith* precede the ulterior and fuller *knowledge*: with *believers* themselves—a full *faith* follows upon a solid *knowledge*."

[2] After all, we are thus constrained to differ in our interpretation from those who think the praying for something not granted, or the attestation of an *intention* to save the whole world, inconsistent in this prayer, and therefore lower the plain words to signify something which has taken place, is taking place, or will take place. So Schmieder, "they must in spite of themselves at last confess"—but is that *believing* and *knowing* in the full sense of those words? And Luthardt similarly concludes that the portion of mankind outside the church will be at last constrained to acknowledge the church, and be brought to obedience toward Christ and His cause. But where is this written? Does not all Scripture predict the contrary? Taking the *world*, that is, according to its meaning throughout this prayer, and the whole Gospel. This goes beyond a final generation of humanity into a final victorious kingdom upon earth.

Hosted by Google

ledge, as we already observed in connection with the first that *the world may know*, ch. xiv. 31, anticipating its application to the Church. And the present word of our Lord points back directly to ch. xiii. 35, and is to be interpreted by it. The world might have, and should have *seen* and *heard* what the glorified Christ poured out for the glorification of His followers. (Acts ii. 33.) But it seeth and heareth not—it seeth not *the Holy Ghost*, neither knoweth Him! (Ch. xiv. 17.) It will not learn and understand what the *love of God* in believers is!

The reading ἠγάπησα is not suitable to the connection, which leads everything back to the Father, from ver. 21 downward; and the καί, without a new ὅτι or ἐγώ, shows plainly that *Thou hast loved* hangs immediately on *Thou hast sent*. Finally, to refer αὐτούς to the world, is altogether out of the question; for the special love of the Father to His own, in whom He seeth Christ, is something very different from the universal love of compassion toward the world: but here the former is evidently spoken of. *This* will be manifested to the world (in vain), for its knowledge, *therein* to take knowledge of the love which *sent* the Son for all.[1]

Ver. 24. Hitherto it has been the already given *internal* glory of believers, beaming forth in ever fuller light and radiance—but now the final glance forward to the goal demands its *revelation*, through the perfect fellowship with Christ, in all its eternal glorification both of body and soul. They alone shall be partakers of *this* full glory, who have been previously (this side the grave or the other) τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν:—but these shall most assuredly! The Lord, when he reaches this point, elevates His tone, changes His petition into an authorised demand, and sets it before the hearers of His Prayer in the form of a strong *promise*. It is perfectly in vain to attempt to degrade this solitary and sublime θέλω by all kinds of observations upon it:[2]

[1] Where we find ἀπέστειλε, it *always* indicates universal grace.

[2] Thus Grotius compares the *supplicating* θέλω and θέλομεν, Mark vi. 25, x. 35—yea, even the *commanding* one, Matt. x. 38—without observing that in the case of Herod's daughter and the sons of Zebedee there is involved a certain challenge of prerogative and claim. So alas Bengel, "I desire,"—though the Gnomon improves upon this. So Tholuck took θέλω for ἐπιθυμῶ. B.-Crusius of course decrees, "Θέλω has no special emphasis, but is simply the expression of a *wish*." Certain it is that it does so occur, and Jno. xii.

Hosted by Google

the immediate feeling which the Holy Ghost, the true Expositor, puts into our hearts as its best interpretation, will be always its best defence. It is no other than a *testamentary word* of the Son, who in the unity of the Father is *appointing* what He wills, at that second limit of His prayer where its petitions cease. (Comp. *I appoint*, Lu. xxii. 29.) At the first limit, when confronting the unbelieving world, His petition sounds out in a ἵνα, the non-fulfilment of which He knows beforehand; but at the second limit, when His kept and perfected believers are in view, the petition takes the higher tone of a serene, majestic *I will!* (In the Heb. N. T. very properly חָפַץ in contradistinction from שׁוֹאֵל.)

Whom Thou hast given to Me—is not (as Bengel thinks) a restriction to the *Apostles* once more, for this follows first in ver. 25 with *these; all* believers are referred to, as in ver. 20, and the δέδωκας is an anticipation, equally with the ἔδωκας as spoken of the glory. Assuredly, he who in his joyful faith knows himself to be given of the Father to Christ, can and will have in Christ through the Holy Spirit, or rather Christ in him will have, such an anticipating assurance of salvation and glory. Notwithstanding, since this springs from the will of Christ alone, and *our* will needs, down to the final probation of death, to urge its humble prayer, we would counsel no man to echo Christ's words—Father in Christ, *I will* to behold one day the glory of Thy Son![1] On the *where I am* see already ch. xii. 26. Our *love* teacheth us that to be *with Christ* would be in itself fully sufficient for blessedness; love desires, even in heaven, nothing beside Him for its unutterable joy:[2] but *faith* knoweth at the

21; 1 Cor. vii. 7, are better examples; but it is equally certain that there is strong emphasis in the word elsewhere (in the Lord's, Be it unto thee even as thou *wilt!*—and *e.g.* Jno. xv. 17)—and if anywhere thus emphatic, certainly it is *here*.

[1] Francke carries this too far. The child-like and simple "Father, I will," is something very different, but even that would be used by no experienced Christian even in his highest devotion. Even Luther's boldness of faith did not take the word so rigorously, "Touching all spiritual things we might even pray confidently, like Christ, Father, *I will!*" But could he use this "*I will*" in his own prayers constantly, and without repugnance?

[2] As the same *love* (in Francke's better words) here also speaks in Christ:—"I will and must have all My children with Me!"

Hosted by Google

same time that His crowned love will endow His own with an equal crown, and therefore scorns not the crown, the highest gift of the Highest Giver. This is the resolution of the contest between *disinterested love* and the *regard to reward.* With the supremest majesty Christ here speaks of *His own* glory and the *beholding* it, as the highest blessedness of His glorified ones; comp. Ex. xxxiii. 18. In "which Thou *hast given*" there does not lie, as Lücke says, "that relation of subordination, which can never be disengaged from the Johannæan doctrine of the Logos."[1] If we embrace the Divinity and the humanity in one Person, speaking after both relations, everything becomes consistent. The humanity says ἔδωκάς μοι concerning the same *glory* which the Divinity at the same time calls τὴν ἐμήν; just as in ver. 5 the *glorify Me* and the *which I had* are similarly related.

He does not, however, say "*My* glory" otherwise than as He appoints it to be shared by *us*. *Behold* is an experiencing and tasting (as ch. viii. 51), for according to ver. 22 the Lord had *given* to us already His glory. When we see Him as He is (it cannot be otherwise, hence the Apostle derives from this his expression, 1 Jno. iii. 2) then shall we behold ourselves also as His co-heirs, receive the manifestation of that which we are and have become, and that without obscuration through a *body of humiliation*, or the *tribulation of the world.* Then, not till then, shall we perfectly understand and enter into the fruition of this prayer. But that all who believe on Christ shall attain to this, to be co-heirs of the glory of Christ, was fore-arranged and fixed in the *eternal counsel of love* between the Father and the Son. *For* Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world! Thus does the Lord, after ver. 5, speak a second time, and takes His own with Him into the same *love*, and consequently into the same glory,—by this *I will* corresponding to the will of the Father. Here we have a better answer to the question, "what was God doing before He created the world?" than that well-known one which Luther gave—"Preparing rods for those who should ask Him such questions!" The answer to the inquiry of *faith*, as humble as it is bold, is here given—He *loved* the

[1] It might have been thought that *the Word was God* would have been sufficient, at the very beginning of his gospel.

Hosted by Google

Son, and, beholding them by anticipation in the Son, He loved His people redeemed from among sinners, redeemed through the glorious accomplishment of the ways of God in the creature.

Ver. 25. And now before the close—we might say, in an accommodated sense, "that all righteousness might be fulfilled"—comes the other side of the question, the complementary reference to the *world*, and how the matter goes with *it*. Not, however, the other part of the world, that which will remain in unbelief, after those who had come to knowledge and salvation are gathered out; this we have amply refuted already, and once more refute it by observing that now in ver. 25 the world remains, as in chap. xii. 47, 48, xvi. 33, xviii. 36, comp. 1 John v. 19. But now follows an explanation of the meaning and significance which alone such expressions as *that the world may be saved, may believe, may know*, can have as used by the Lord in solemn earnestness of truth and under the inmost pressure of all-embracing love. He thus also *distinguishes* once more at the conclusion of His prayer between the world and His own; and it certainly refers to the final decision, penetrating into eternity just as does the glorification of His own. He cannot close with "and I *in all*," or even "and I in the world"—only "*in them*."

Having reached this point He appeals appropriately to the "*righteous* Father:" this being the only instance, even as the "*holy* Father" was before! They are by no means identical; for the assertion that ἅγιος and δίκαιος are one and the same in St John springs only from a misunderstanding of the true meaning of the former.[1] First, it is plain that the Lord testifies, acknowledges, addresses the *righteousness* also of the Father, because that essentially belongs—though not as a punitive justice so much as righteousness to be acknowledged, as effectually condemning and abolishing sin—to the work of *redemption* and *atonement*. And this expression of the Redeemer, now going to His death, remains a firm *dictum probans*, pointing to the reason why thus and thus only He must sanctify Himself for those who are to be sanctified.[2] Let him who would take

[1] As Neander understands and translates it.

[2] Lange speaks of Christ's presentiment that He must now experience the full severity of the righteousness of God, even as He knew it in His Spirit.

Hosted by Google

away from the offering for sin all reference to the Father's righteousness, that a vainly imagined love alone might remain, humble his ignorance to hear this word of the Son Himself—*Righteous* Father, *I know Thee!* And in Thy righteousness! That righteousness which *spareth not* Me! But this is not enough; nor is it the fundamental sense of the word, as preceding the subsequent words—it is rather something included and presupposed. For the consecration of Christ to death for the sanctification of sinners, the δίκαιος was already involved and merged in the ἅγιος; and ch. xvi. 10 taught that the communication of the righteousness of Christ to believers was at the same time itself righteousness before God. Thus the further and especial reference of the *righteous Father* lies in the separation between believers and the world, in the *judgment* which will follow even after a universal redemption. "He appeals, finally, to the holy righteousness of the Father, in regard to the issue of the great hour of conflict impending between Himself and the world which knew not God." So says Lücke, feeling after but not quite finding the truth; for this concluding part of the prayer does not *merely* refer to the coming hour of conflict, nor merely to the decision between *Him* and the world;—for His disciples stand with Him in opposition to it. C. H. Rieger writes better, though rather hinting than unfolding the truth, concerning this "final testimony" (as Schmieder terms it): "These final words contain no longer any express petitions; they rather seal with an Amen all that precedes. The beloved Son of God *gives over all things*, which He had contemplated on His own behalf, on behalf of His disciples, and all other believers (we would add,—on behalf of the world's believing), *to the righteousness* of His heavenly Father, and thus testifies His confidence that the *Righteous Father will do all things well with regard to all these.*" It is the unfolding which is wanted here: He will do all things *justly* and well—in regard to His Son's sufferings, the condemnation of the unbelieving world, the blessedness of believers—in regard to these three, for His righteousness' sake! This last testimony is a confession, an acknowledgment before God, a ὁμολογία and ὁμολόγησις before the Father, just like that preliminary and prophetic one, Matt. xi. 25. Luther makes one aspect of it prominent in words which are too rough

Hosted by Google

for the gentle love of Christ, but true enough in themselves: "Thou doest right in letting *them* (who know not Thee and Me) go in their obdurate blindness to their father the devil; so that *they* must not behold anything of My glory either in the word and knowledge of faith, or in future direct contemplation." Christ *cannot* say, or ask, or will—Righteous Father, let also the unsanctified behold My glory, let sinners in their sin come to the bliss of heaven! Let those who have not known Thee and Me have, notwithstanding, eternal life!! (Mark the glance back to ver. 3 in this σὲ οὐκ ἔγνω.) The other aspect is thus expressed by Grotius: "inasmuch as it becomes the Father's *equity*, that those should be rewarded who have renounced the world, and worshipped Him." And it is true that the Scripture admits from the beginning such a benign צְדָקָה toward the just, acknowledging, saving, and blessing them, in contradistinction to the evil; although צַדִּיק is never of itself and as such *benevolent*, yet benevolence itself is strictly connected with relative righteousness. God is not unrighteous, that He should not respond to the faith and love of those who apprehend His grace. (Heb. vi. 10.) For "it would be to His holy grace an unrighteousness, if He did not respond with all His faithfulness both as God and Creator, to every approach of His creatures"—as we have said elsewhere upon this passage. But it would be onesided, to regard this alone as signified here. Olshausen combines both, holding fast the connection of this *righteous Father* even with ver. 24 (out of which it immediately arose!): "For the Son appeals, for the granting of this prayer, to the righteousness of the Father,[1] who both excludes the God-estranged world from beholding His glory, and brings all believers filled with God to that great consummation." See 2 Thess. i. 4–10, according to which it is a *righteous thing with God* to recompense tribulation to some, rest to others—*vengeance on those who know not God*, but glory to His holy believers. *Compare, once more, the* ἐκδίκησις of Lu. xviii. 7.[2] God remains *righteous* even in the redemption which justifies sinners, and makes them holy: partly, inasmuch as He has set forth the

[1] Still better, *Grounds* His θέλω upon this, that He himself knoweth and beareth in Himself the eternal counsel of the righteous Father.

[2] And what we said upon it, Vol. iv.

Hosted by Google

upon the sinful world, love will unite in one the sanctified. Love is the eternal essence of God, and the principle of all His dealings." (Fikenscher.) The indwelling of His love is not simply "the *practical* end" of the knowledge of the name and nature of God, as it is very generally distinguished; but *the love being in them* is itself the living, consummate *knowledge*, even as it is the glorifying *unity* and *glory*. (Gal. iv. 9; 1 Cor. viii. 3; Eph. iii. 18, 19; 1 John iv. 7–16.) But the love of the Father dwelleth in us only through the mediation of the Son; we know and we have the Father only as the Father of Christ, nor shall we possess Him throughout eternity otherwise: —thus the *last word of all* after the last is, I IN THEM! Let this conclusion, also, be well pondered and felt! The Lord does not conclude by saying—And Thou in them![1] Let ver. 23 be carefully compared. Finally, Christ in us, the love of the Father in us—is no other in its truth and power than the *communion of the Holy Ghost*, who bringeth through the grace of Christ the love of God to man:—this therefore approves itself as the final aim and end of this petition.

Such a conclusion is a more sublime seal than any Doxology, than any Amen of other supplication—which indeed could find no place here. That all things which He prays for and promises may be Yea and Amen,—the Lord of glory went, after these words, over the brook Cedron, to the woe of Gethsemane, to the death of the Cross, and, through the death endured for our sins, to His holy and righteous Father. This death is the centre of all that grace and truth of which the word bears witness to faith; out of this death cometh life, and love, and sanctification, and unity, and eternal glory.

[1] As if that should be fulfilled even in eternity which Fichte referred to the present time: "When Christ hath brought men to God, He Himself, in His person and name, as the way and the guide, will be forgotten!" Not only His *name*, but His *person* as mediating, abideth; the mysterious word of 1 Cor. xv. 24 is certainly not to be understood as if the power of Christ, the Abolisher, was to be abolished.

END OF VOLUME SIXTH.

Hosted by Google